

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3333

cash dividends and cash seized at the time of the General Aniline seizure.

Interhandel representatives have given assurances that payment to the Swiss will be accomplished in a manner which will not adversely affect the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

The Attorney General will appoint a committee of financial experts to advise him on when and how to conduct the sealed-bid sale in order to secure the highest price. Mr. Kennedy said he would request Interhandel to suggest the name of at least one American expert to serve on this committee.

Government proceeds from the sale of GAF would go, by law and like other proceeds from alien property sales, into the War Claims Fund. This fund is used to pay claims to American citizens for injuries and property damage suffered at the hands of enemies during World War II and for other claims authorized by Congress.

Legal negotiations were conducted over a period of months with Dr. Alfred Schaefer, chairman of the board of Interhandel, John J. Wilson, Washington counsel for Interhandel in the long litigation and other representatives of the company, Mr. Kennedy said.

Interhandel's full name is the Societe Internationale pour Participations Industrielles et Commerciales S.A. "Interhandel" comes from its name in German, the International Industrie und Handelsbeteiligungen A.G., previously known as I. G. Chemie. The firm's headquarters are in Basle, Switzerland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to see this long-delayed move get underway. I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], for their persistence in bringing about the passage of the enabling legislation; and I commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for his long study of the basic problem of vested enemy assets. I hope we will see the fruits of this sale in the form of higher employment, a vigorous management policy, and increased competition in the industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted legislation permitting the early return of the vast General Aniline & Film Co. to private American enterprise after 20 years of Government control. A bipartisan group in the House and Senate—led by Representatives HOWARD W. ROBISON and LEO O'BRIEN—joined several of us in the Senate in bringing this legislation to fruition after many years of delay and obstruction by its opponents. It was our view that this important company and its thousands of employees could reach levels of growth and prosperity under private enterprise which could not possibly be attained under continued Government management.

The Department of Justice has advised me that passage of this General Aniline & Film Co. sale legislation significantly strengthened the Government's hand in the negotiations leading to a settlement of the long drawn-out litigation over the ownership of General Aniline & Film Co. and that the actual sale of General Aniline & Film Co. will be accomplished on a competitive bid basis as authorized in the sale legislation. Certainly all of those who worked

for the sale bill are delighted with its important contribution to the Government's efforts in this case.

It should be made clear, however, that under our bill, General Aniline & Film Co. could have been sold without any settlement of the pending suit and that nothing in our bill required a settlement on any particular terms.

It was the publicly stated position of the Department of Justice that any challenge to a sale of General Aniline & Film Co. during the pendency of the ownership litigation would be successfully overcome within a year.

Under these circumstances the terms of settlement are bound to strike some observers as extremely generous from the point of view of the United States. What the United States has agreed to, in effect, is a 50-50 split with Interhandel in the proceeds of the sale of the contested shares of stock with Interhandel agreeing to absorb tax and other claims in the neighborhood of some \$24 million out of its share. The net total payment to Interhandel under these arrangements could exceed \$60 million.

Any settlement of this magnitude deserves close scrutiny to make certain that it is in the interests of the United States. In the first instance, this will be the task of the district court, which will have to approve any consent judgment submitted by the parties. But, Congress also has a legitimate concern in this transaction, and congressional study of the settlement would not be at all inappropriate.

There is no suggestion that the Department of Justice has not been sufficiently zealous in the protection of the interests of the United States in arriving at this settlement. I recognize as a lawyer that there is no certainty in any lawsuit and also that a settlement will lead to the disposition of GAF with the least amount of further delay.

At the same time, we cannot lose sight of a number of salient facts: First, that GAF is an extremely valuable asset of the Government; secondly, that hundreds of millions of dollars have been realized by the Government for payment to American war claimants out of the sales of other vested assets, in most cases with no settlement at all with the former owners and in no case with a settlement approaching this amount; thirdly, that any amount paid to Interhandel as a result of the sale of the stock of GAF will reduce the funds which would be available for payment to American war claimants—some of whom have received nothing on their war claims to this very day.

Charges have been made that a Government deal to turn GAF over to a Swiss cartel has been concluded under the direction of William H. Orrick, Jr., now Deputy Under Secretary of State and formerly Assistant Attorney General. The settlement announced today makes it obvious that these charges are without foundation. Under no view of the settlement can it be fairly said to constitute a transfer of GAF to Swiss control. On the contrary this settlement will guarantee, in accordance with the GAF sale bill, that GAF will be sold

to American interests and never be returned, whether to its former German or alleged Swiss owners.

In order that the record may be complete on this issue, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the text of a February 13, 1963, letter from me to Mr. Orrick on this very point and Mr. Orrick's reply of February 19.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

MR. WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JR.,
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ORRICK: It has been reported to me that you are in charge of negotiations for a possible settlement of the General Aniline case.

As you know, legislation was enacted during the last session of Congress authorizing the Government to sell this property despite the pending litigation as to its ownership. In my judgment, the continued operation of this company under Government management is a severe handicap to its growth and prosperity. Its sale to private enterprise on favorable terms, therefore, is a matter of considerable importance to the thousands of employees of the company and the communities in which it operates.

In the hearings on this legislation, Government representatives expressed complete confidence in the ultimate outcome of the pending litigation and any new suit challenging the constitutionality of the sale bill. Under these circumstances, I am concerned about the reports that the Government is contemplating a settlement which may involve a substantial payment to the litigants and which may serve to delay unreasonably the Government's disposition of this property.

Since this is a matter of particular importance to several areas in the State of New York, I would appreciate your furnishing me with full information with respect to this situation.

Your cooperation, as always, is very gratifying.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

FEBRUARY 19, 1963.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I have your letter of February 13 and appreciate your natural concern in the disposition of the General Aniline case.

As you undoubtedly know, I was intimately involved in this case when I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division. However, since I have been working in the Department of State for the last 9 months, I no longer have any direct responsibility over the General Aniline case, nor am I in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case.

I can assure you, however, that from my experience in the Department of Justice and from my knowledge of the Attorney General's view of the case, the Government would not enter into any settlement which did not coincide with a fair estimate of the Government's case on the merits, or which would unreasonably delay the Government's disposal of the property.

May I suggest that the present officials in the Department of Justice would be in a better position than I to furnish you with a more complete and up-to-date status of any negotiations which may be in progress.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JR.

3934

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 4

Mr. KEATING. As will be noted, Mr. Orrick's reply categorically denies that he has had any direct responsibility over the General Aniline & Film case since joining the Department of State or that he is in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case. I am disclosing this exchange of correspondence at this time in fairness to Mr. Orrick.

It may very well be that Swiss pressures were a factor in the willingness of U.S. officials to agree to the generous terms of this settlement. The General Aniline & Film litigation has been an irritant in United States-Swiss relations ever since Interhandel filed its suit, and I know that our Ambassador to Switzerland has been anxious for a settlement. In these circumstances, it is not unlikely that foreign policy considerations played as important a role as the merits of the case in inducing the United States to accept a 50-50 share of the proceeds with Interhandel.

General Aniline & Film is a major American concern with important facilities in a number of areas in New York. My major concern always has been to allow this company to operate under conditions which would best promote the welfare of the communities in which it operates and its thousands of employees. For this reason I am gratified that as a result of the General Aniline & Film sale bill we have moved very close to the day when this company can become part of the mainstream of our free enterprise system and reach its full potential of growth and prosperity, for the benefit of the stockholders, the employees, and the communities where the plants are located, all of whom have been unanimous in their desire to remove the dead hand of the Government from this company and return it to the free enterprise system.

I am hopeful also that this objective will be accomplished in a manner which fully protects and safeguards the interest of the United States.

CONTRADICTIONS ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as new and alarming information on Cuba comes to light, many persons are asking if the United States suffers from an intelligence gap.

It is becoming clearer each day that no such gap exists. The events of the past year, as the story of Soviet-Cuban aggression has slowly and painfully unfolded, have shown that our intelligence community is hard at work, producing accurate information—in other words, "doing the job."

We do suffer, however, from unwillingness of our top officials to believe what our intelligence produces, from attempts to gloss over facts revealed by our intelligence, and in some instances attempts to suppress information entirely.

Last weekend the testimony of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, given before the House Foreign Affairs on February 19, was released. His statements directly contradict Secretary of Defense McNamara's incredible assertions that Cuba

is not being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries, and fully confirm statements I made on the Senate floor on January 31.

This is another of many striking instances in which high Government officials have first denied, then admitted, facts I have disclosed about Soviet activities in Cuba. These examples strongly suggest that the crisis of confidence now existing is more the result of refusal to convey hard truths to the American people than any gap in our intelligence capabilities.

On January 31 I said, with reference to Soviet activity in Cuba:

What they are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists trained and armed in Cuba.

This was emphatically denied from the top level within a week. On February 6, in a 2-hour television presentation on Cuba, the Secretary of Defense said:

I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against Latin American countries. It is a matter that is of constant interest to us and one we are monitoring continuously.

If our Government is "monitoring continuously," as the Secretary said, how do we account for what happened only 8 days later? On February 19, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency flatly contradicted the Defense Secretary's statements. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America.

At another point, Mr. McCone states: Some guerrilla forces in Peru are equipped with Czech weapons which most probably came from Cuba.

How did that get by the "continuous monitoring" of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. McCone also revealed that the trainees in Cuba are instructed to operate rifles and machineguns they would presumably steal or capture from local police or security units. They are being taught how to manufacture homemade "Molotov cocktail" bombs.

Comparing the terrorist tactics of the early Castro days with the present training, Mr. McCone said:

Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet block, including veteran Spanish Communists.

From a news conference held February 28 we learned that Soviet bombers have been tracking U.S. aircraft carriers for some time. An announcement of flights which occurred from January 27 to February 22 was made, according to news reports, 6 days later, on February 28. Interestingly enough one of the Soviet planes flew over the carrier *Forrestal*, just off Gibraltar, on February 22. Many are wondering whether the fact that a group of editors and publishers

were aboard, and saw the overflight, encouraged the Defense Department to at last release this interesting information the day before the *Forrestal* docked with the newspapermen aboard.

Examples such as this suggest that the crisis of credibility is not the result of any intelligence gap but rather the result of a gap in disclosing information to the public.

According to many reliable press reports covering the events of the past year, CIA Director McCone was warning as early as last August that the Soviets probably would place offensive missiles in Cuba. As substantiation for his position gradually came into the public view—first through unchecked refugee reports, then through thoroughly checked intelligence material, and later through statements of alarmed Members of Congress of both parties—our Government kept busy denying everything. At last, on October 22, when the President clamped down a blockade, the frightening facts were suddenly officially unloaded on the American people.

There are disturbing indications that an attempt is being made to use the intelligence community as a scapegoat and whipping boy for the present crisis of confidence in the Government's handling of the Cuban situation. No intelligence system is perfect, and it may be that problems of coordination and cooperation have hampered the CIA's effectiveness on some occasions. In my judgment, however, we would be placing the onus on the wrong source if we blamed the fact gatherers rather than the policymakers for the failure to give the American people an accurate and complete picture of Communist activities in Cuba.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] to fill the Republican vacancy on the National Forest Reservation Commission.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHAM], as members of the special committee.

To the Mexico Interparliamentary Group, the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG],

anti-Western stand. Mali became independent in September 1960. It has 4.5 million people—hearings, part 2, page 845.

Forty-second. Nigeria, gaining independence October 1, 1960, from Great Britain, received a grant aid of \$20.5 million for 1962 in addition to U.S. loan commitments of \$225 million. Among projects is a TV educational program at a cost of \$343,000 for 1963 although Nigeria has only two TV stations and very few TV sets. Population is 36 million—hearings, part 2, pages 875 through 891.

Forty-third. For helping tourism in Tunisia there is an estimated obligation of \$167,000 for fiscal 1963. Communist bloc countries have extended over \$46 million in aid tied in with technical assistance and/or sale of capital goods—hearings, part 2, pages 951, 952—hearings, Foreign Operation Appropriations for 1963, House Committee.

Forty-fourth. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for project for airline training for Tanganyika—hearings, part 2, page 975.

Forty-fifth. Two hundred thousand dollars allocated for a translation center in the African regional region together with an additional \$139,000 for translation services to translate African technical publications into French—hearings, part 2, page 982.

Forty-sixth.—Cambodia given enough rifles so that each man had two rifles apiece—hearings, part 1, page 493.

Forty-seventh. Peace Corps has contract of \$59,000 with Institute for the Study of Man and another contract for experiment in international living for training of Peace Corps members—hearings, part 1, page 727.

Forty-eighth. Peace Corps men assigned as evaluators of other Peace Corps men at an estimated cost of \$1 million—hearings, part 1, page 733.

Forty-ninth. Ten physical education directors assigned to Ivory Coast by Peace Corps—hearings, part 1, page 735.

Fiftieth. Peace Corps sent man, wife, and nine children to Philippines at a one-way cost of \$13,190. The man's salary is \$10,190. He is former executive secretary to the Newspaper Guild of Greater Boston and a Harvard graduate—hearings, pages 782, 783, 840, and 841.

Fifty-first. AID agency requested information from Library of Congress to compile and supply information to ascertain nations which have or have not received aid from the United States in order to answer questions by House Committee on Foreign Operations Appropriations—hearings, part 3, page 253. Hearings, Foreign Operations Appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Fifty-second. In Lebanon, at the stock breeding farm furnished by U.S. funds, there were nine stalls to each bull. Lebanon is one of the wealthiest countries in that area—hearings, part 3, page 278.

Fifty-third. Cyprus, which received \$679,000 in aid in 1962 from the United States bought up \$2 million of our gold at the end of 1961—hearings, part 3, page 375.

Fifty-fourth. India, which has received a total amount of about \$4 billion in U.S. aid is now negotiating to buy a Russian Mig aircraft plant—hearings, part 3, page 383.

Fifty-fifth. Iran, in the last quarter of 1961, purchased \$16.1 million of U.S. gold, yet that country is under the mutual security program for \$54.4 million exclusive of military aid—hearings, part 3, page 433.

Fifty-sixth. Iraq, which has, through fiscal year 1962, received a total of \$67.5 million in U.S. aid, bought a total of \$29.8 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 467.

Fifty-seventh. Request for \$225 million for Pakistan, for projects on which there are no commitments, has been programed for 1963—hearings, part 3, page 499.

Fifty-eighth. Cambodia, to whom we gave \$24 million in fiscal 1961, turned around and bought \$12 million worth of U.S. gold—hearings, part 3, page 556.

Fifty-ninth. Indonesia, to whom the United States gave \$44 million in aid in the last half of 1960, bought up \$24.9 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 607.

Sixtieth. Cambodian Highway, paid for by the United States, to cost—hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963 House committee—\$15 million, was so badly planned and built that it resulted in a cost of \$32 million and now must be further repaired at an additional cost of \$2.7 million—hearings, part 3, page 636.

Sixty-first. Vietnam, where our marines and other defense forces are fighting and dying, taxes U.S. goods received in that country as gifts. These are distributed in part to private businesses which sell them at a profit—hearings, part 3, page 684.

Sixty-second. Other nations with a system of taxing U.S. aid and selling it for a profit similar to Vietnam's are Cameroon, Guinea, Kenya, Morocco, Senegal, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Cambodia, Korea, Thailand, Greece, India, Israel, Pakistan, and Turkey—hearings, part 3, page 693.

Sixty-third. In Taiwan, Nationalist China, a sawmill was built in the mountains with U.S. aid; then it was learned it would not saw the type of logs produced there—hearings, part 4, page 714.

Sixty-fourth. AID is spending \$120,000 for an orientation course for employees going overseas, together with their wives and adult dependents—hearings, part 3, page 744.

Sixty-fifth. Fraudulent invoices from Laos for generators and sawmill equipment of \$207,500 were paid by the United States when actual cost was \$44,000. No recovery was made of the money expended. Laos also bought \$1.9 million of U.S. gold while taking \$24 million in aid for 1961—hearings, part 3, page 775.

Sixty-sixth. Four hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars granted by the United States to bring Japanese labor leaders to this country—hearings, part 3, page 811; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

(Mr. WILSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WILSON of Indiana's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress long interested in American labor, it gives me pleasure to stand here today and say to the Department of Labor, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary—well done.

For labor, for Congress, indeed for all Americans, this is truly a golden occasion not only in time, but in terms of achievement. Congress passed the bill which created a separate Department of Labor half a century ago, on March 4, 1913. President Taft signed the bill and the one Department of the President's Cabinet which has as its sole concern people became a fact.

Working together, the legislative and executive branches of this Government have examined, been deeply concerned with, and worked hard to improve the welfare of the working force of America—those 70 million men and women who form the backbone of this country.

It is appropriate, therefore, to turn back the clock for a moment, and recall what working conditions were in 1913. I do not mean remember personally, mind you, I am having a 50th birthday myself this month. But perhaps that, too is symbolic. I am proud that labor has always been my own special concern. But we all know, of course, that working conditions were far different in 1913 than they are today. Long hours of toil, wages not far above the subsistence level of living, unsafe, unhealthy sweatshops, child labor, little security—such, frequently, were the conditions of labor only 50 years ago. Weariness and fear were the daily companions of many a workingman—or the child that may have toiled beside him.

What has happened since, through the joint efforts of the Congress and the Department of Labor, and with the cooperation of both labor leaders and management, has been a continuing record of betterment for our working people. Child labor and immigration were among the major problems solved in the beginnings of the Labor Department. Social security, fair labor standards, minimum wage and hour specifications, unemployment insurance—these are only some of the benefits which have given Americans a better way of life.

Through two World Wars, the Department of Labor helped marshal a labor force ready to meet the production needs of the Nation. The National Employment Service helped in solving the problems of the depression period of the early

3240

1930's. The Women's Bureau sought, and continues to work on, the status of women as a contributory factor in the economy, as more women than ever before are entering the ranks of labor. The Bureau of Labor Statistics furnishes us with data on the cost of living, family budgets, employment, and the occupational outlook—facts we must have at our fingertips in reviewing and anticipating trends in the economy of the Nation.

It has been a tremendously changing 50 years. It is gratifying to look at the working man and woman today and say, for the most part: their life is good. Both the Labor Department and Congress are to a large extent responsible for this march of human progress. It was not too long ago that unions were secret societies whose members had their names blacklisted by industry. Today, employees may negotiate freely.

But our problems are not all solved. The rush of automation in our new technology is setting a pace which the Labor Department and the Congress must equal and even anticipate, if the needs of the man and woman on the job are to be served. It is not an easy task.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which the Congress passed last summer is undertaking to train 400,000 persons in the next 3 years. The Area Redevelopment Act has translated into terms of action the concern for parts of the country where technological change must itself sponsor other changes. Fifty years ago we were just moving out of the horse-and-buggy age. Today, we are talking about why we cannot live on Venus. In such terms, we realize that although America has come a long way from the plantation life and industrial towns of colonial days, this country is still just laid out in the rough.

We are not going to forget the working people in all these changes. The Department of Labor and the Congress will see to that. People cannot be ignored merely because machines are also more numerous. We faced other problems in the past. We will continue to do the same, in the same spirit, in the future.

It is often said that good things come in small packages. The Labor Department is the smallest branch of the President's Cabinet. But for tens of millions, it has certainly been a good thing. I have been proud to work with it and for it in its high goal of achieving the best for every man. In 50 years, we have come a long, long way.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPACT

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to establish a Susquehanna River Basin compact between the States of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland.

Last year I requested that a comprehensive survey and report on the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin be undertaken, and this survey, which will take some 6 years

to complete, is now underway by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my proposed measure is to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and other natural resources of the entire Susquehanna River Basin.

The establishment of such a compact would also provide for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, hydroelectric energy and public recreational facilities.

Some 15 million people at present live and work in the region of the Susquehanna River Basin and its environs which covers a geographic area in excess of 27,500 square miles, and the government, employment, industry, and economic development of the entire region and the health, safety, and general welfare of its population are and will continue to be vitally affected by the use, conservation, management, and control of the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin.

Demands upon the waters and related resources of the basin are expected to mount rapidly because of the anticipated increase in the population of the region projected to reach 23 million by 1980 and 33 million by the year 2010, and because of the anticipated increase in industrial growth projected to double by 1980.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest requires that facilities must be ready and operative when needed to avoid the catastrophe of such things as unexpected floods or prolonged drought such as we experienced last summer.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will adopt this measure at an early date so the organization of this vital compact can be undertaken.

PLACING THE CUBAN CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we here on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate have been asked to partake of a smorgasbord of innuendo, misshapen facts, false alarms and all kinds of advice regarding foreign policy, particularly in respect to the Cuban situation.

On the right hand, we hear advice recommending that we should send forth a military expedition to unseat the regime of Fidel Castro. On the left hand, we hear advice that we should effect a reconciliation with the leftist Castro regime because it was driven leftward only because some unidentified capitalistic interests wished to do in the Cuban revolution in the first place. Both brands of advice seem unpalatable to me.

In the late 1930's and the early 1940's, the America First movement displayed its

fare of disunion and distrust. Now apparently we have in our midst the "America last" critics. According to these critics, General de Gaulle is right, Chancellor Adenauer is right, Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker is right every propertied Cuban emigre is right and every rumor ground from the plush, expense-account bar in Miami is right. According to these critics, President Kennedy is wrong, the entire intelligence-gathering apparatus of the U.S. Government is wrong and Defense Secretary McNamara is wrong.

It is human nature for fallible human beings to second-guess other human beings, particularly a President of the United States. President Kennedy sits today in the world's loneliest job in America, a welter of hair-raising problems—the thrust of Soviet imperialism, a nuclear arms race that threatens to destroy the world as we know it and maybe a few others.

President Kennedy not long ago repelled with this stanza of poetry to his critics and at this point I quote it with approval:

Bullfight critics ranked in rows
Crowd the enormous plaza full
But only one is there who knows
And he's the man who fights the bull.

I recall with a shudder the numbers game of the unsavory McCarthyite past. The numbers game in new dress today revolves around Soviet facilities and men stationed in Cuba.

The numbers game is, of course, not new. Shakespeare has the following passage in Othello during a debate between the Duke of Venice and his council regarding the size of the enemy Turkish fleet.

DUKE. There is no composition in these news that gives them credit.

FIRST SENATOR. Indeed, they are disproportioned. My letters say a hundred and seven galleys.

DUKE. And mine, a hundred and forty.

SECOND SENATOR. And mine, two hundred.

Now in place of the Turkish fleet we are talking as I said earlier, about the Soviet presence in Cuba.

It would seem to me that any fair-minded critic would say that the recent extraordinary 2½-hour briefing of news correspondents by Defense Secretary McNamara and President Kennedy have placed the Cuban crisis in proper perspective.

The President is not saying that the United States is content to have alien military forces stationed in Cuba. The President, as I understand him, is saying that the nature of the Soviet presence is not of a nature to justify resort to military means at this time to expel it.

Mr. McNamara, the Defense Secretary, as I read the transcript of that press conference of his I mentioned earlier, has stated that the United States has the will and the means to discover in swift fashion potential use of defensive weapons in Cuba for offensive purposes.

We should, of course, look askance at the positioning of Soviet arms in Cuba. We should desire and work for their re-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3241

moval. We should encourage the establishment of a truly democratic administration in Cuba—but not the return to entrenched power and privilege of the Cuban counterparts, now in Florida, of the French Bourbons who in a statesman's cogent words: "Forgot nothing, forgave nothing."

Once again Cuba is an example of how we react with a military fixation to a problem whose largest element perhaps is nonmilitary in character. President Kennedy has stated this danger as being one of Cuba as a base for subversion in the Americas. He has also stated that time is short in which to bring about the social and economic reforms necessary to forestall brutish, totalitarian revolution in the developing countries of the Americas.

An essential fact is that frustration about Cuba is not new. Cuba has troubled us for some 150 years. This in itself should indicate that some quick solution is not available.

And that leads me to a collateral comment. There exists a myth that the Monroe Doctrine is some magic key to resolving difficulties. In the first place, Messrs. Monroe and Adams did not conceive of their policy as "doctrine"—the word was not employed until 1895 during Cleveland's second administration when Secretary of State Olney employed the term. Nor did Messrs. Monroe and Adams ever speak of "enforcing" it—if it was enforced, it was enforced only by courtesy of the British Navy. Both recognized it could be enforced only in cooperation with another European nation—in this case, as I said, the British fleet.

In recent years the Monroe Doctrine has in fact been mutualized under the aegis of the Organization of American States which provides for consultation in any possible application of the policy.

I would also like to point out another historic parallel which has in the past gotten us in trouble—the use of the U.S. mainland as a base for operations for filibustering against Cuba and other nations. This began with such adventurers as Aaron Burr.

I think that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is to be commended for not playing politics with diplomacy. Diplomacy should not be conducted by means of Fourth of July oration papers.

Once again, there is no miracle tablet to cure our frustration in Cuba and in other troubled spots. There is the danger, too, of smaller nations or their self-appointed representatives playing one great power against another in frenzies of an excess.

President Kennedy has said that the Cuban problem must be dealt with as part of the larger worldwide issues. We should exercise the wisdom that the President has suggested and that he himself exercises. In an age of nuclear destruction, the charade of military might in the form of orations and saber rattling, is indeed unforgivable and holds the most profound consequences.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce an editorial on the Cuban situation that appeared in the February 28, 1963, issue of the Portland, Oreg., Jour-

nal and a column by Art Buchwald that appeared in the March 3, 1963, editions of the Washington Post.

POLITICAL WAR OVER CUBA

When President Eisenhower was in office, and particularly during the 1960 campaign, the Journal criticized leading Democrats for partisan attacks on foreign policy of a kind that were damaging to this country.

Now it seems to us that some Republicans are guilty of the same thing over Cuba.

Cuba rightly is a foreign policy issue. Communist control of a country 90 miles from our shores is a serious matter. The presence of 17,000 Soviet troops and heavy supplies of Soviet military equipment is not to be taken lightly.

But the nature of the threat from Cuba ought to be kept clearly in mind. We see no possibility of an overt attack from Cuba on this country. We accept the proof offered by the Defense Department from its surveillance that Cuba does not possess missiles of the range needed to strike this country.

The chief value to Castro of Russian troops and materiel is to guard the Castro administration from an internal uprising by Cubans themselves or to defend against attack from abroad.

But the main thing we have to fear from Cuba is its use as a base for Communist revolution in the rest of Latin America. If Cuba is to remain a political issue, that ought to be the focal point of discussion.

The recent visit to Washington of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt is a reminder of this aspect of the Cuban threat. Betancourt is convinced that Communist terrorism in his country is fomented and supported from Cuba.

If the Reds should succeed in destroying the moderate kind of government Betancourt has been trying to establish in Venezuela, after years of misrule by rightist dictatorship, then their threat to the rest of Latin America will have been multiplied. Communist control of Venezuela would be many times more dangerous than Communist control of Cuba. U.S. policy toward Latin America has to be a lot more comprehensive than simply getting the Russians out of Cuba.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has promised to withdraw thousands more of Soviet troops from Cuba. Nobody knows for certain that he means it. But there ought to be a moratorium on debate over this particular point until we see whether he fulfills his promise.

Some of the critics of our Cuba policy are not clear on what ought to be done. Few of them recommend that we invade the island. They simply say that we ought to do something.

Lots of things are being done. Time will be required to see whether they will accomplish the goal short of all-out nuclear war that nobody wants.

Meanwhile it helps to keep things in perspective if we remember that blame for Castro's rule can be widely shared. The bearded dictator came to power during the Eisenhower administration. He consolidated his position after Kennedy became President.

Everybody concedes that the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt was badly bungled. Nobody knows whether it would have led to Castro's overthrow even if it had been well planned and executed.

We think the debate on Cuba ought to be carried on more responsibly than it has been in recent weeks.

GETTING THE NEWS IS ALWAYS A BATTLE
(By Art Buchwald)

There has been a lot of talk about news management in the Government these days, but if you go through history you can find that every presidential administration tried to manage the press in one way or another. We found an old transcript the other day of

a press briefing between Abraham Lincoln's press secretary and White House reporters, which shows that even in those days attempts were made to bottle up vital news of interest to the public.

Here are excerpts from it:

Question. Mr. Nicolay, yesterday the President gave a speech at Gettysburg, and he started it out by saying, "Four score and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation." Sir, would you mind telling us the names of the fathers he was referring to?

SECRETARY. I'm sorry, gentlemen. I can't reveal the names at this time.

Question. The Saturday Evening Post, which is published in Philadelphia, said he was referring to Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

SECRETARY. That's just conjecture. The President is not responsible for everything written by his friends.

Question. The President said yesterday in the same speech that the country was engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. He didn't say how he intended to win the war. Does this mean he has a no-win policy?

SECRETARY. The President in his speech was only concerned with the Battle of Gettysburg, which incidentally we won. The Department of War will give you full details on other battles.

Question. The Department refuses to give us any information. We don't know how many troops were used at Gettysburg, who commanded them, or how many casualties there were. All we were given were some lousy photos of Confederate gun emplacements. How can we be sure the Confederates still don't have artillery hidden in the hills around Gettysburg?

SECRETARY. We have constant surveillance of the hills. To the best of our knowledge all southern artillery pieces have been removed.

Question. What about Confederate troops? There are an estimated 17,000 in the area.

SECRETARY. We have the South's promise they will be removed in due course.

Question. Mr. Secretary, why didn't Mrs. Lincoln go with the President to Gettysburg?

SECRETARY. Mrs. Lincoln feels that her place is at home with her children. But she did send an telegram.

Question. In talking about the government of the people, for the people, and by the people, did the President have any particular group in mind?

SECRETARY. Not to my knowledge, gentlemen. But I'll check it out just to make sure.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the President in his speech yesterday indicated he intended to manage the news.

SECRETARY. How did he do that?

Question. He said in the same speech, "The world will little note nor long remember what was said here." It seems to me in this phrase he was intimidating the newspapermen who were there.

SECRETARY. I don't think you have to interpret the speech in that manner. The President's remarks, written on an envelope, were off the cuff, and he felt there was no reason to be quoted. An official version of his speech will be made available to the press in due time, as soon as the President has a chance to go over it again.

SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNAWARE OF BENEFITS

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the "big heart" project of the Social Security Administration was publicized by Jerry Klutz, Federal news reporter for the Washington Post, in the two articles appearing in the March 3 and 4, 1963, issues of that newspaper. It is always pleasing to read of private and public efforts that go beyond the bounds of duty. And it is particularly pleasing to read about these efforts of the social security agency which provides a margin of assistance to millions of low-income Americans. These articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNWARE OF BENEFITS

(By Jerry Klutz)

A couple of weeks ago, on a chilly night, a vagrant crawled into a large trash can in downtown Baltimore and fell asleep.

The next morning, the man, who appeared in his 70's, was awakened when he was tossed into a 30-foot refuse pit.

A mechanical shovel was about to pick him up along with a pile of junk and throw him into the city incinerator when a truck driver saw the elderly man struggling in the debris and rescued him.

Bernard McKinley Jackson was taken before municipal court on a vagrancy charge. He said he had no money, no home, no job; and he asked to be placed where he could be looked after for awhile. The judge cooperated by sentencing him to 90 days in city jail.

But Jackson was better off than he had thought and his near tragic experience was a blessing in disguise. His story came to the attention of an employee in the sprawling headquarters of HEW's old-age and survivors insurance in the Woodlawn section of Baltimore.

The employee wondered if the vagrant was eligible for social security benefits. It took him only a matter of minutes to get a preliminary answer from OASI's stable of IBM electronic machines, the largest single number in operation anywhere.

The machines spit out 313,134 names of Jacksons, the 17th most popular surname in OASI's file of 140 million names. There were hundreds of Bernard Jacksons, but the robot revealed that only one Bernard McKinley Jackson was insured and eligible for benefits—and wasn't being paid them.

OASI investigators quickly confirmed that the penniless wanderer was the Bernard McKinley Jackson in their files. A claims expert visited Jackson in jail to explain that he should have been paid benefits for the past 9 years—since he became 65—if he had only applied for them.

Jackson signed the claim and he will receive \$520 in back benefits, the maximum he's entitled to under the law, and \$40 a month for the remainder of his life.

Unusual case? Not really. OASI has what is officially known as a leads program but which is also referred to as a big heart project to seek out aging persons who are eligible for social security benefits and to make payments to them.

Social security benefits are being paid monthly to 17 million men, women, and children and its rolls are growing at a rate of nearly a million annually. You'd think that anyone who pays into OASI's insurance fund would apply for benefits the minute he qualifies for them. But this isn't necessarily so.

To launch its "big heart" project, a few buttons were punched on the electronic machines and they served up the names of 1,156,000 insured persons who were over 65 and who had filed no claims for benefits.

A cross-section of 350,000 names were selected and they were sent to OASI's district offices which serve sections covered by the original addresses of the missing insured, many of them dating back 26 years when social security started.

As a result, more than 100,000 persons, many destitute like Jackson, are being paid benefits they had overlooked. OASI employees were unable to locate 191,086 of the 350,000 and the remainder weren't eligible for one reason or another.

OASI then took another batch of 240,000 names, persons it described as "less obviously insured," and sent them to its field offices along with what few clues it had on their possible whereabouts.

This program is in process now, and up to a few days ago agency employees set in motion machinery to pay benefits to 17,311 additional persons who were no doubt delighted with their windfalls.

The high degree of automation at OASI makes possible the "big heart" program. The machines may be cold and calculating but they also provide material for the human touch which an agency like social security can't afford to lose.

The machines, for example, keep Victor Christgau, OASI Director, supplied with the names and addresses of each person on the rolls who reaches age 100 and also the birthdays of the 412 recipients of social security who are more than 100 years of age. Christgau sends each of them happy birthday greetings. Incidentally, a dozen of the century oldsters are still actively employed.

OASI EMPLOYEES HAVE HIGH PRODUCTIVITY RATING

(By Jerry Klutz)

Employees of HEW's old age and survivors insurance are cocky, confident and proud. They have good reason for their reassuring attitude.

They have one of the best work records in or out of Government. The President has publicly commended them on their efficiency. Administrative costs takes only 2 cents of each dollar spent by OASI, a low figure. Employee turnover is lower than the average in either HEW or the entire Government.

Employee productivity is rising steadily, an estimated 5 percent this 1963 fiscal year and a gain of 2.8 percent is contemplated in fiscal year 1964. If production had continued at the 1962 level, about 2,900 additional employees and \$18.5 million in new funds would be required to operate the world's largest insurance system.

OASI pioneered the use of electronic data processing machines and its own experts helped to develop some of the most advanced and sophisticated IBM machines at its headquarters in the Woodlawn section on the outskirts of Baltimore.

Someone guessed it would take a million Federal employees to handle OASI's chores if there were no electronic machines to work their magic round the clock. Could be. Consider this: One machine can produce more work than 500,000 employees with desk calculators.

More than 18 million persons are paid monthly benefits and an average of 300,000 new claims for benefits are received each month. About 75 million persons work under social security and contribute to the OASI fund each year and 280 million earning reports, supplied by their employers, are recorded on their individual accounts.

The latter makes OASI the world's largest bookkeeper but it has no books to keep. The records are kept on tape and microfilm. The names and social security numbers of more than 140 million persons are maintained on 2,000 magazines of microfilm that can be stored in a single room.

The agency handles its duties with a 35,000-man staff of whom 10,000 are at its Baltimore headquarters, moved from Washington during World War II, and a goodly number of them commute from the Washington area.

OASI employees have no job worries. The agency has never had a layoff and its people are well aware that social security has overwhelming public and political support and is here to stay. Despite the giant machines that gobble up the work, the staff has had to be increased gradually to make effective the more liberal amendments voted to the social security law.

The employees are confident that one of these days, or years, Congress will give it another major task—to manage the proposed medicare program for the aged through social security.

If and when that happens, the headquarters building, the fifth largest in Government, would need to build another wing to house an estimated 3,000 new employees to manage it.

OASI has perhaps the most extensive program of preventive medicine for its 10,000 headquarters employees than any agency in Government. Dr. Leon Kochman heads a 31-man staff of doctors, nurse and technicians.

Physical exams are given every 3 years to employees under 40, every other year for those between 40 and 55, and annually for those over 55. Electrocardiograms are available to those 45 and older. A number of cases of cancer, tuberculosis and other diseases have been detected in their early stages by the tests. The employees are referred to their private physicians for treatment.

Chest X-rays, hearing tests and inoculations, for small fees, also are available to employees. The health office also keeps its own blood reservoir for the use of any employee and his family. The health office goes further and checks cafeteria employees who handle food even though they aren't employed by OASI but OASI employees are protected by this activity.

Only emergency treatment is administered by Dr. Kochman and his staff. Ailing employees must be treated by their private physicians who, Kochman stressed, have accepted the OASI program.

Perhaps one of the secrets of the splendid productivity record of OASI employees is the fact that they have a large voice in setting what is regarded as reasonable standards, or guidelines, for their work. Cardpunchers and other mechanical groups are given two 10-minute breaks daily, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon.

Sixty percent of OASI's employees are G-girls and women hold many of the key posts in the agency. Civil service's federal service entrance examination is most used by OASI which takes about 25 percent of all persons hired from the register. More than 5,000 employees have been hired from the FSEE during the past 2 years.

GABRIEL RICHARD, PRIEST, POLITICIAN, AND PATRIOT

(Mr. RYAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago today, marked the beginning of congressional service of Gabriel Richard, priest, politician, and patriot. He was elected as the Territorial Delegate to the 18th Congress of the United States from the Territory of Michigan. His term was to commence on March 4, 1823.

Monsignor Willebrands, member of the secretariat, brought the Ukrainian prelate back to Rome from Moscow by train after a visit there last week. On another mission to Moscow, last fall, the monsignor arranged for the presence in Rome of two observers of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Vatican sources said the success of Monsignor Willebrands' two missions have considerably improved relations between the Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches. The 70-year-old archbishop, who had been a Soviet prisoner for 18 years, arrived in Rome last Saturday.

The plan for the archbishop's release was evolved during the Vatican council last fall. Giacomo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the congregation for oriental rites, met the two Russian Orthodox observers and asked for a good-will gesture toward Archbishop Slipyi.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 22, 1963]

ROMAN CATHOLICISM: KREMLIN COOPERATION
Pope John XXIII, for all of his dislike for communism, is willing to be polite about it. Gone is the defiance that Pius XII used to hurl at the Kremlin; instead Rome makes such amicable gestures as inviting Russian Orthodox observers to the Vatican council. Last week the Pope produced in Rome a living gain from his policy of easing tensions: Ukrainian Archbishop Josyf Slipyi of Lvov, freed after 18 years of Soviet confinement.

The spiritual leader of the Ukraine's 2 million Byzantine-rite Catholics, tall, bearded Archbishop Slipyi, 71, is a Jesuit-trained theologian who was elevated to the episcopacy in 1939. Slipyi (pronounced slee-pay) protested a postwar Russian attempt to force Byzantine-rite Ukrainians into the Russian Orthodox Church, and in 1946 was imprisoned, charged with "political crimes during the German occupation." Confined to a tiny cell with four Catholic priests, he said mass in secret, using dried crusts of bread for hosts and wine made by letting grapes and raisins ferment in a glass. In 1953, his hard-labor sentence was reduced to house arrest in Lvov, but 2 years later, Slipyi was shipped to a Siberian old people's home, where he was put to work as a servant.

MEETING WITH TWO RUSSIANS

Slipyi's release is the diplomatic handiwork of two close Curia friends of Pope John—Augustin Cardinal Bea, chief of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and Gustavo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, which supervises Byzantine-rite Catholics. Late last November, Bea arranged a quit meeting between Testa and the two Russian observers at the Vatican Council. Testa smoothly pointed out that the Pope had officially disavowed a protest prepared by a group of Ukrainian bishops at the council objecting to the presence of the Russians, tactfully brought up the subject of Archbishop Slipyi's long confinement. The Russians promised to do what they could, and last month notified Cardinal Bea that Slipyi would be freed. A fortnight ago, Bea's chief assistant, Dutch Msgr. Jan Willebrands, flew secretly to Moscow, escorted Slipyi by train to Vienna and then on to Rome. Slipyi had a personal audience with the Pope, has since been resting at the Byzantine-rite monastery of Grottaferrata, 15 miles southeast of Rome. He hopes eventually to return to Lvov.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

The Vatican regards Slipyi's release as only the beginning. "This was a simple act of personal respect by the Russian Government for Pope John," says one Vatican official. "It also gives us hope that other negotiations will work out." There is little doubt as to who would be the subjects of other negotiations: Hungary's Josef Cardinal Mindszenty,

a political refugee in the U.S. legation at Budapest since the 1956 uprising, and Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague, who was seized by Czech Communists in 1950, has not been heard from since.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME OF HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been speculation in the newspapers of my State—and I am quite sure I know from where that speculation comes—concerning the changing of the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam, known as Hungry Horse Lake, to Truman Lake or Truman Reservoir.

Mr. President, I am a great admirer of former President Harry Truman. I know he did a great deal to bring about the consummation of the project known as Hungry Horse. However, I believe in States' rights, to a certain extent, and I must say that I would not be in favor of changing the name of Hungry Horse Lake to Truman Lake, or to any other designation, with one exception.

Some years ago my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I introduced a bill to change the name of the reservoir behind Hungry Horse Dam to Harry Kelly Lake. We did so because Harry Kelly, who was long and favorably known as Hungry Horse Harry, fought for and worked for the Hungry Horse project long before anybody else in the Flathead area. Many times his was the lone voice in the wilderness—and I make that as a literal statement.

However, we were not successful in our endeavor to change the name.

I feel that, as a matter of State pride, if the name of Hungry Horse Harry Kelly is not to be attached to the lake, the name Hungry Horse Lake ought to be retained.

I am in full accord with a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial, which states in part:

Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—

It is one of mine, also, I say incidentally—

rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower.

To that I say, "Amen."

Insofar as the dam is concerned, Mr. President, the present name should continue in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune of February 28, 1963, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HUNGRY HORSE DAM IT IS AND SO IT SHOULD REMAIN

We have admired former President Harry S. Truman. As president he supported and advanced water development projects in Montana and other Western States, but we are unalterably opposed to the proposal of congressional advocates to change the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam to Lake Truman.

This is included in a list of dams and reservoirs for which name changes are being sought to honor former Presidents and Senators. The effort to make the nauseous pill more palatable by splitting the name between reservoir and dam only compounds the felony and confuses one and all.

If a personal name were fitting for the Hungry Horse layout, none other would be so deserving of the honor as the late Harry J. Kelly, pioneer Montana newspaperman and longtime Kalispell weekly publisher. He was the first champion of Hungry Horse Dam—at a time when supporters were scarce and scoffers numerous. He began his crusade of editorials and speeches in support of the project in 1933 and continued it until 1944, when Congress approved the Bureau of Reclamation plans. He gained the nickname of "Hungry Horse Harry" and earned the title of "Father of Hungry Horse Dam."

It is not surprising that a few years ago a proposal to designate the reservoir Kelly Lake was supported by the Montana congressional delegation. We were not in favor of that despite Kelly's qualification for the honor.

A St. Louis Dispatch editorial hit the nail on the head when it said: "Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower."

There is a lot of interesting legend attached to the name Hungry Horse. We should cultivate and preserve it instead of trying to water it down.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 or 3 weeks, at various intervals, I have placed in the Record the names of free world ships engaging in Cuban trade. These names have been received on the basis of facts supplied by the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration, as well as other reliable sources of information. All the names have been placed in the Record, giving the flag under which the ships sail as well as the number of ships involved.

Mr. President, some ships are still engaging in trade with Cuba, and the number is greater than many people realize.

A dispatch to the Baltimore Sun, published in the February 19 issue of that paper, reported that eight ships flying flags of countries outside the Communist bloc were sighted by crewmen of the U.S.-flag freighter SS *Santo Cerro* during the 3 days that vessel was in a Cuban port, discharging its cargo of ransom medicines, drugs, and baby foods.

Three of the vessels reported seen by the crewmen were of British registry, three flew the Greek flag, one was Norwegian, and the other Yugoslavian. Together with the dozen or more additional freighters from Communist countries observed by the U.S. crewmen there were thus 20 or more ocean freighters in that Cuban port in the 3-day period cited. They represented a total freight carrying capacity which, if maintained with any degree of regularity, would go far toward taking care of a great proportion of Cuba's food and other requirements.

I ask unanimous consent that the Baltimore Sun article be printed in the Record in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FREE-WORLD SHIPS SEEN IN HAVANA—EIGHT NOTICED DURING 3 DAYS RANSOM VESSEL WAS THERE

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Eight free world ships were in Havana harbor during the 3 days the last ransom-bearing American-flag freighter, the S.S. *Santo Cerro*, was there, it was learned today.

This number in such a short period of time is considered significant, because the Kennedy administration pointed out that since only 18 free world ships had called at Cuba during the entire month of January, stringent regulations were not necessary against trading with Cuba.

Therefore, the administration's only restriction was to prevent vessels calling at Cuba since January 1 from loading U.S. Government-owned and financed cargo at U.S. ports, but not at foreign ports.

SEEN BY CREW

Seen by the crewmembers of the *Santo Cerro* from February 10 to February 13 were three British vessels, three Greek, one Norwegian, and one Yugoslav. In addition to these free world ships, they saw 10 Russian and several East German vessels. No mention of Poland was made.

The *Santo Cerro* carried the third shipload of ransom medical supplies, drugs, and baby foods demanded by Premier Fidel Castro in exchange for the 1,113 released Bay of Pigs prisoners.

The American-flag *Santo Cerro* loaded in Baltimore and sailed February 7. Her cargo brought up to \$25 million the total sent to Cuba. The full ransom is \$53 million.

The fourth ship is to be the German-flag *Priamos*, made available by the Standard Fruit Co. for loading at New Orleans beginning Thursday. The ship sails regularly from New Orleans.

NO REFUGEES EXPECTED

The *Priamos* is to load 2,300 tons valued at \$1,100,000. She is not expected to bring back any refugees, the American Red Cross said, because she will head directly from Havana for Costa Rica to pick up bananas.

Like the *Santo Cerro*, the *Priamos* is a refrigerated vessel.

The 3,027-gross-ton German freighter will be the first of the four to load at a gulf port. The first—the SS *African Pilot*—took on her \$11 million cargo at Port Everglades. The *Shirley Lykes* and the *Santo Cerro* loaded at Baltimore.

H.D.B.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been placing the list in the Record from time to time, in the hope that the efforts of the President of the United States and of the State Department—to have the countries involved voluntarily prohibit their ships from moving in and out of Cuba, at the risk of losing their cargoes—can succeed, and so that the economic quarantine or shipping quarantine will be actually such.

On February 7, I published another list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In that list I mentioned the names of ships, and included in the list was that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*. Upon learning of this, the owner of the ship contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Stockholm and reported that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect, and asked rectification of that error. We have checked on that. Apparently the Maritime Commission, in the case of this one ship among many,

listed it erroneously, and the following day I submitted a corrected list.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a letter to me, together with a list of the ships referred to.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ROYAL SWEDISH EMBASSY,
Washington, February 13, 1963.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: On page 1950 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of February 7, 1963, a list has been reproduced at your request on free world ship arrivals in Cuba, January 1-31, 1963. In this connection, may I draw your attention to the following:

Among the names of ships listed that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*, occurs. Upon learning this the owners of the ship in question contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Stockholm, reporting that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect and requesting a rectification. On instructions from Stockholm, my Embassy contacted the U.S. authorities concerned, conveying to them the information received from the shipping line. They immediately confirmed that the listing was erroneous, and the following day issued a corrected list, a copy of which I enclose herewith for your ready reference.

Against the background of the above facts, I would very much appreciate if you could kindly have the Record corrected on this point.

Sincerely yours,

GUNNAR JARRING,
Ambassador of Sweden.

**REVISED LIST OF FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS
IN CUBA, JANUARY 1-31, 1963**

NAME OF SHIP—FLAG OF REGISTRY

1. *Arlington Court* (British).
2. *Cannaregio* (Italian).
3. *Capetan Petros* (Greek).
4. *Gloria* (Greek).
5. *London Confidence* (tanker) (British).
6. *London Splendour* (tanker) (British).
7. *Meishun Maru* (Japanese).
8. *Mousse* (Lebanese).
9. *Overseas Pioneer* (tanker) (British).
10. *Pampas* (British).
11. *Perseus* (tanker) (Greek).
12. *Redestos* (Greek).

NOTE.—The *Cooranga* (Swedish) and the *Freedom First* (Panamanian) were carried on a previous listing as having called at Cuba between January 1-31, 1963. More complete information now available discloses these two ships did not call at Cuba during the period indicated.

(Prepared by Maritime Administration,
Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.)

**TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR
DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO**

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this speech is a most unhappy occasion for me. The people of Idaho and the Nation were saddened on July 23, 1962, by the sudden death of Senator Henry Dworshak.

I had known Senator Dworshak for many years. It is true that although we sat on the opposite sides of the political aisle, and we disagreed on many policies and issues, I always had the greatest respect for his integrity and energy as a legislator on the national scene.

Henry Dworshak was a kind man, a

dedicated man. He was the type of man that you could always count on for a helping hand. He had an extraordinary way of dealing with people. He always looked and acted the part of a distinguished Senator. He had a friendly, humble, homey manner; yet he was always dignified, courteous, and always businesslike.

During his lifetime, Senator Dworshak was a printer, a sergeant in a machine-gun battalion in World War I, a newspaper editor, and a legislator. Before coming to the U.S. Senate, he served four terms in the House of Representatives. After the people of Idaho elevated him to the U.S. Senate he served in this great body for 14 years. During the 22 years that he served in the House and Senate, he remained a devoted public servant. He voted his conscience and his duty, as he saw it, for the American people.

During his tenure of 22 years he was on many important committees and was the sponsor of legislation of national importance. He was a member of the House and later the Senate Appropriations Committees, where he gained a vast knowledge and understanding of all the operations of the Government. His particular interest was in the field of natural resources. He worked closely with those agencies which manage our water, land, mineral, and forest resources. He was ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee at the time of his death. He always advocated close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in planning and developing new projects.

To his good wife, and to his four sons, I would like to say that I miss him in the Senate; however, I would like to add, that a grateful Nation shares in their great loss.

**TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR
CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO**

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am among the many who will miss Senator Dennis Chavez, as a friend, a legislator and as a wise American. He was truly a great man.

Senator Chavez was a native son of New Mexico and was the oldest of eight children. He served his State ably as a member of the State legislature and was next elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he served from 1931, until his appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1935, where he served until his death in 1962.

Dennis Chavez had served 9 years in the Senate before I was appointed to the Senate. I became closely associated with him on many legislative matters and found in him a faithful friend. Our friendship grew for each other through the years and I considered myself a member of his family.

Senator Chavez served for many years on the Appropriations Committee and I will always treasure the years that I was able to work with him on appropriation matters. He was a great organizer, armed with the tools of logic. He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on

1963

American effort, Ambassador Finletter will accompany him on this recruiting rally.

BRITISH DENY OPPOSING MIXED-CREW A-FORCE
LONDON, February 27.—A Foreign Office spokesman today described as utter nonsense a Washington dispatch to the Times of London saying Britain has shown unwillingness to take part in the proposed NATO mixed-crew atomic sea force.

The spokesman pointed out that British Defense Minister Peter Thornycroft told the House of Commons last month that the government was considering how it could contribute to such a force.

Thornycroft said, "We attach importance to the multinational element, and we are considering how best to support our allies either by the manning or in support facilities."

The Foreign Office position can be developed with national contingents, which could be withdrawn, and with mixed contingents, which would be irrevocably committed to NATO. The Times report said that because of the extra cost, the British might not join in the mixed or multimanned force.

It is clear that British military circles are eager to concentrate on a NATO command made up of strictly national contributions of atomic capacity and have little enthusiasm for the American-sponsored project of mixed crews.

Mr. Speaker, after having read these articles and the editorial I began to wonder just what we are trying to do. Perhaps a Solomon could figure out this exercise in futility, but I cannot. I do not believe the French or the British—despite any British denials as the headline suggested in the last article—have any more enthusiasm than I do for this proposal.

Where's the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Anaheim (Calif.) Bulletin, dated February 22, 1963. This editorial is an indictment against the managed-news program of the administration which was so devastatingly attacked by Arthur Krook in a recent article in Fortune magazine. Mr. Krook is considered the dean of American journalists.

The editorial follows:

WHERE'S THE TRUTH?

It has always been considered disrespectful to insinuate that the President of the United States is "lying." This man, supposedly, is above the normal level of ordinary man and not to be placed in a position of having to hide his intent or his actions. When a President of this Nation does assume this position then he has lost his effectiveness to govern and represent the Nation.

President Kennedy is not truthfully acknowledging conditions in Cuba. Either

he is not being truthfully informed or he has reason to hide actual conditions. If he were certain of his statements that Russia has removed all missiles and withdrawn her troops; if he were certain that there is not a continued buildup of Russian power, he would not hesitate to prove his beliefs by demanding on-the-spot inspections.

He evades the truth continually. He must receive the same reports as the entire Nation; it cannot be possible that he listens only to his advisers.

Representative DON BRUCE, of Indiana, reported to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that he had received information from the "highest authority" that: "highly placed officials in Cuba from several major Western Powers friendly to the United States counted the unloading from Soviet vessels in Cuba of 82 to 88 Soviet missiles."

Ydigoras Fuentes, President of Guatemala, forwarded information through Dr. Carlos Todd, head of the much-respected Cuban Information Service, that there is no question that Soviet submarines (presumably based in that "fishing port" in Cuba) are "loading arms and men" onto the South American continent.

These reports are discredited, not verified and those attempting to inform the administration are generally personally smeared to ruin their effectiveness in future reportings.

There is talk that President Kennedy made an agreement with Khrushchev that he will not interfere with his activities in Cuba; that Cuba will become the basis for future agreements that will involve "trades" in settling the West Berlin situation or be involved in the disarmament agreements.

From the surface it would seem we have a President who is scared to death of Russian threats; a President who completely discounts the abilities or desires of his own people to defend themselves; a President who feels that the people are completely incapable of deciding the type of government or way of life they desire; and a President who has sealed himself off from contact with those whom he is supposed to be representing as official head of this Nation.

Lies have a strange way of coming to the surface. When they do someone suffers, and in this case it will be the entire Nation.

A Welfare Plum Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from Newsweek, February 25, 1963:

PERSPECTIVE—A WELFARE PLUM TREE

(By Raymond Moley)

Certain incontestable facts which apply to President Kennedy and his brother Robert should go a long way in explaining their proposal to establish a national service corps. While neither has ever directly confronted the realities of life with which less fortunate boys contend in their youth, both are, from what they say, exceedingly warmhearted. Furthermore, except in the tumult of political campaigns, neither has ever been engaged in the local life of the great cities, grappling, as local authorities must, with community problems. Both are dedicated politicians

whose success in 1960 shows that they overlook no opportunity to build a following among the less fortunate denizens of our Nation. Finally, both are determined to expand Federal power far beyond its present limits.

The antennas of warmhearted people who have had little experience in social problems vibrate violently because some people are poor, wayless, and often wayward. They want to do something without delay and with little consideration of the practical limitations which confront general social amelioration. If these considerations are joined to a thrust for political power, the way becomes clear, just as it appeared to Harry Hopkins 25 years ago, to use social welfare as a means to that end.

FIRST BLOOM

The proposal for a national service corps found a chance to run an acknowledged pilot operation when the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act was passed in 1961 with an appropriation of \$30 million to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

No doubt, this plum tree caught the eye of the Reverend ADAM CALYTON POWELL, whose heart throbs with compassion for his flock and its offspring. A nonprofit outfit in New York City with \$9,000 of local funds was allocated \$250,000 of Federal money for a so-called domestic peace corps operation. Now there is evidence upon which we may be able to judge what will happen if the nationwide plan is adopted.

Senator FRANK LAUSCHE has detailed this example of Federal irresponsibility and extravagance. In the organizational budget, salaries include: project director, \$14,000; Peace Corps program coordinator, \$13,000; senior research director, \$13,000; recruitment coordinator, \$10,000; chief of training program, \$13,000, and numerous other high-salaried positions. As Senator LAUSCHE says, if such salaries are applied to units throughout the country, they "will work havoc with local and State salary schedules." He adds: "The proposed nonprofit corporation would rent what is supposed to be office space in a church. The owner of the church is the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center, Inc. The rental to be paid is \$17,000 a year for a space that has been 'unoccupied.'"

IMPLICATIONS

Two days before, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS complained that Federal agencies are competing to see who can shovel the most money out to POWELL's activities and by doing so curry favor with the political power in Harlem and chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee. Senator WILLIAMS documented other activities of the Congressman which have drawn national attention.

The implications of the New York project are clear. It outlines the intent of building up a Federal political machine through Federal patronage and intervention into State and local welfare concerns. Senator LAUSCHE makes the solid point that in the field of delinquency the work of more than 2 million citizens touches the problem directly—social and welfare work, teaching, recreational welfare work, and law enforcement. "Thus, without the parents, we have 1 worker to every 13 juveniles."

Robert Kennedy's staff study shows clearly not only that there could be indoctrination of volunteers but that an important aspect of the program involves Federal participation, through the Corps, in the educational system of the country.

Judging by the multitude of his proposals and his many delineations of gruesome conditions across the Nation, John F. Kennedy looks upon the United States, to borrow a phrase, as his personal stum project.

Are We Being Surrounded?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. WILLIAM C. BRAY**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that Americans are beginning to ask if we are being surrounded. International developments of the last several months are not encouraging; they are in fact frightening when the total picture is considered.

I do not suggest that we allow ourselves to be frightened by these developments, but a realistic appraisal of our new position must be the foundation of any new policies designed to push back the advancing Communist tide before it engulfs us.

The following editorial from the March 3, 1963, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer expresses the concern of sober-minded citizens:

Are We Being Surrounded?

When it became evident, a number of years ago, that communism was arising from the ashes of World War II like a voracious monster, the United States was forced to adopt a policy of containment—one that would not saddle Soviet Russia or Red China, but would check them from an unbridled career of imperialism such as the world has never known before.

This policy of containment, shored up judiciously by several military pacts and supplemented by economic and military aid to threatened nations, worked remarkably well until relatively recent years.

But where is it now?

UPON WHAT MEAT HATH CAESAR FED?

For some time, Nikita Khrushchev has ranted about being surrounded by American bases, and called West Berlin a "bone in my throat." But as long as we stood our ground, the boss of the Communist camp obviously didn't want to risk any military involvement with the United States.

Now he talks about hurling 100-megaton hydrogen bombs at the United States. He warns that if we touch Cuba, or Red China, or East Germany, or any Communist puppet, the U.S.S.R. will plunge its rockets upon our cities and soil.

Upon what meat hath this Caesar fed?

The meat that always emboldens dictators—compromise, concession, timidity.

When the late Robert Frost, a great poet but not a political man, visited Moscow some months ago, he was told by Khrushchev: "The United States is too liberal to fight."

KHRUSHCHEV UNIMPRESSED AT VIENNA MEETING
There had been basis for this deadly assumption.

Astute reporters said that the burly Russian dictator was unimpressed by President Kennedy at their meeting in Vienna. Whatever his personal impression may have been, we can discount it in Mr. Kennedy's favor because he was not well at the time. He was suffering from his back ailment; he had been through a long and arduous quest of the presidency, and his advisers obviously had not prepared him for the harsh challenge with which Khrushchev was to confront him.

But in the practical matters that count, things have been going better for Khrushchev ever since. The walling off of East Berlin was begun as a tentative measure. Had there been a reaction such as Sir Win-

ston Churchill gave when a similar ruse was tried in Austria, this matter would have ended there. But we did nothing. So the wall was made permanent—illegally—and refugees who tried to scale it were shot in the cruelest of circumstances.

When Castro's Communists had only a fragile hold on Cuba—and a modicum of help from the United States could have turned the Bay of Pigs invasion into a liberation of the island—Khrushchev said in so many words that he had no intention to, and could not, maintain a Communist base there 10,000 miles away.

What has happened since that great stage-managed victory for the United States on the eve of the last congressional elections?

Seemingly Khrushchev has decided that the gate is open for a worldwide Communist expansion—that whatever he does, we will find some words to excuse it. Like defensive weapons.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk said at a conference in Texas that "a Soviet military presence on that island (Cuba) cannot be accepted."

He, or someone else, probably will be saying the same thing when Russia uses the big airfields in West Africa to push new beachheads in to South America.

Our overseas bases are being dismantled. One political gauche after another has ridiculed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and we are even at odds with the Canadian government. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is crumbling.

As a British statesman said the other day, our blind colonial policies must have been a delight to the Kremlin. The probable next prime minister of England says: "Don't talk to me about Polaris or Skybolt—I want neither." The probable next prime minister of Canada has been noted for his coexistence policies and favoritism of allowing Red China to join the party.

The Organization of American States, which promptly rallied to our side when it appeared we would take some action to remove or at least quarantine Castro, is bound to become progressively less eager to act the longer we tolerate the Russian presence in Cuba, and the more Communist terrorists are indoctrinated and trained in Havana for operations throughout the hemisphere.

Meanwhile, we are making no more transcontinental bombers, no more supersonic planes of any appreciable size. When the B-52's and the B-58's wear out, they will be gone. Squadrons of our B-47's are being brought back from overseas bases. Our Jupiter and Thor rocket installations are being dismantled. Obsolete? Perhaps. But at the same time, better rockets than the Russians smuggled into Cuba.

Take a look about. Are we now being surrounded? Who or what brought us so far, so fast?

Washington Report**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include my Washington Report of February 27 dealing with the Operation Water Moccasin III. Since the report was written, the Army has revealed the various nations involved.

While I concur in the training of our allied officers in jungle warfare, the emphasis of my objection lies with the imposition of this training upon the population living within this 1½-million-acre area.

The training should be carried out within the enclave of our military reservation. The towns and villages should not be subjected to military law.

A similar operation was carried on in California in the summer of 1951 and was billed as a United Nations takeover, and the civilian population which refused to cooperate were threatened with prosecution.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

Now hear this and listen well. By the time this Washington Report reaches you, there will be underway one of the most fantastic and, to me, truly frightening, military maneuvers ever to be held in the United States. It is called Exercise Water Moccasin III, and is just as deadly. These maneuvers will be held on a 2,500-square-mile area of 1,500,000 acres, covering all of four counties and parts of four other counties in the State of Georgia, just south of Savannah. It will include the participation of 16 foreign allied nations and involves guerrilla warfare, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency.

The area, for lack of a better name, will be called the mythical country of Claxtonia, a free world nation. Claxtonia is to be invaded by foreign guerrilla troops, whose goal is to take over that mythical country. Opposing troops will be brought in by parachute drop in an effort to resist this invasion. It seems impossible to get much information on these maneuvers from the Pentagon intelligence, which denies any knowledge of this operation. Those in the know refuse to identify the 16 foreign allied nations involved, nor can we determine the number of troops involved. They may be members of NATO, SEATO, or CENTO.

A form sheet came to my desk in response to many inquiries, but I cannot tell from this sheet which department issued it. The memo indicates that the operation will include 600 personnel. Other authoritative sources say there will be 3,000 personnel. If there are only 600, that would be one man for every 2,500 acres, which is ridiculous on the face of it.

The cities, towns, and villages, and the rural inhabitants of Claxtonia, are supposed to participate in this operation and will be targets of intensive propaganda campaigns by the invaders and by the counterinsurgency troops. This intensive propaganda campaign will be carried on by three local radio stations which will be supporting the counterinsurgent guerrillas of Claxtonia, and by two radio stations in Savannah supporting the invading guerrillas. The inhabitants of Claxtonia have been requested to take sides. Having done so, they are to house, feed, keep and aid the guerrillas of their choice and transport them to ambush sites. The various cities are to either accept or impel the invaders. The psychological effect on American citizens placed in this position will be enormous. These maneuvers will last for about 3 weeks. Signs have been posted throughout the area in five different languages. There will be foreign observers as well as a U.N. contingent.

It is my belief that this operation comes squarely under Article 43 of the United Nations Charter. This, of course, will be vehemently denied by the State Department, as was everything else that happened in Cuba, the truth notwithstanding.

We do not know whether African troops will be involved or not, but we do know that

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1115

it the flesh and blood they gave it in our representative system of balanced government.

Both historically and currently, the American system is based upon a fundamental, revolutionary idea: The importance of the individual human being and of his right to grow and develop to his full potential.

What has happened in America—chiefly within the last 50 years and only as a result of manifold struggles—is that logical projections have been and are being developed from this idea and applied to the full range of 20th century life—economic, social, psychological, as well as political.

The common good is no longer just a political matter involving governments. It is vitally affected by economic and social patterns. So they, too, must reflect the common good—under the sanction of social pressures which express themselves in attitudes of social responsibility and civic conscience, backed only when necessary by governmental laws and actions.

The continuing success of our American system, in my opinion, has rested chiefly on two interdependent factors which have given it a unique character.

The first of these is the concept of freedom as opportunity. Compared to other societies, ours is an open society to a very high degree.

Opportunities for education and career advancement are ever more widely available. The individual man and woman enjoy a degree of human dignity unprecedented in any other part of the world.

The social mobility possible in America is still unprecedented, extending to the dignity of those who labor, giving the workingman a self-respect greater than that of any workman in the world.

Admittedly, however, there are imperfections which must be removed. We must strive even more ceaselessly to extend these opportunities and this dignity to every member of all groups in our society, no matter what his race, color, religion, origin, or status. Only in this way can we attain the accomplishment of the American idea.

There is a second factor, however, which has made for the flexibility and greatness of our American system. We Americans are so accustomed to talking about individual rights that sometimes we overlook the other basic concept. It is that we in America view freedom as responsibility.

This responsibility begins, of course, at the level of the individual citizen. It requires emphasis on self-reliance and the dignity of work. It includes his duty to respect the rights of others. It extends as well to those obligations of his which have to do with civic participation.

It is the duty of every citizen not only to cast his ballot, but to cast it as wisely as he can—and this is not always easy.

There is a danger that the voter may mistake words for substance, panaceas for basic solutions, and be deluded by slogans and labels such as conservative, liberal and progressive. Life can be oversimplified—made all black or all white. Conservative, liberal and progressive are not mutually exclusive concepts. There are important elements of basic values in all three.

We should respect conservatism—because we know the measureless value that is our heritage to save, to cherish and to enrich—because we believe that everything that is soundly built for the future is built in the present on the foundations of the past.

We should respect liberalism—because we should be more concerned with the opportunities of tomorrow than in the record of yesterday—because out of the past and the present a better future can and must evolve.

And we should respect a progressive point of view—because the opportunities and challenges, facing us now and in the future, are

of such size and scope that we can never halt and say: "Our labor is done"—because we believe in stable, ordered change and human progress—in the perfectibility of the individual human being and of the human society.

The flourishing of the American system requires a sense of responsibility, not only on the part of individual citizens, but especially on the part of America's leadership. I am not speaking alone of political leaders, but of the leaders of all phases of our society as well.

To the extent that they do not exercise their power and influence in the direction of the common good, they are undermining the very system that has given them that power and influence.

This requirement begins, it seems to me, with the elemental personal characteristics of sincerity and honesty, candor and integrity.

These are old-fashioned virtues that we associate with the men who formed this Nation and upon which the Nation was founded.

I believe that political leaders today must demonstrate the same personal integrity and accept the obligation to insure that the governments they lead also operate with integrity—and that this includes the concept of fiscal integrity.

I believe that political leaders have the affirmative duty ruthlessly to prune out wasteful and nonessential expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

I believe that political leaders, at all levels, have an obligation to preserve and to strengthen the Federal system devised by our Founding Fathers.

This system joins our States in a Nation that allows a sharing of sovereignty, the promotion of diversity within unity, and the assurance of government close to the people.

I believe that to preserve this system there are certain basic principles we must adhere to. The local community can justly appeal to the State for help in meeting its economic and social needs only if it does all in its own power to satisfy these human wants at the local level.

The States within our national union, in turn, should call for vigorous Federal leadership and action in areas of concern to the States only as they display and practice such leadership themselves. For the guarding of States' rights requires, before all else, the meeting of States' responsibilities.

And so it is in the largest of our neighborhoods—the world itself. We can lead the forces and extend the frontiers of freedom everywhere only as we practice this freedom—with responsibility—in our own national life.

This freedom must be a chain in which all men ultimately touch hands. Within this concept of freedom, one can speak of the equality of nations and the rule of law only as he practices this equality where he lives.

On this day four years ago, I pledged my every effort that the government of this State would serve the well-being of all—that we would work for new opportunity, for economic growth that would secure and enhance the well-being of all the people.

Thanks to the efforts of dedicated men and women, we have brought New York State to a new and historic threshold of opportunity.

Therefore we are not here merely to look proudly on the past—but confidently toward the future.

For this inauguration—this beginning—should and must signify more than the start of a new term of office. It must mean the beginning of a new stage of growth and progress, shared by all the people of New York State.

Our efforts in the immediate years ahead will be directed especially to four areas:

1. Improvement and extension of the opportunities for higher education for all;

2. Expansion and up-dating of facilities for training to meet the challenges of automation and the opportunities of a revolution in technology;

3. All-out dedication to a further acceleration of sound economic growth and expansion of job opportunities which are basic to a fuller life for all the people;

4. Greater emphasis on improving the quality and quantity of research and development activities to assure the building of our future in the years ahead.

These steps are fundamental and inter-related factors that are necessary for the dynamic growth of our society. They are essential as well to the fulfillment of the people's aspirations for better housing, health, cultural and recreational opportunities—and, most importantly for true equality of opportunity for all.

And above all, I pledge that I will continue to strive for the best ways to preserve and strengthen our American system—the best means to insure an ever richer fulfillment of the American dream and the aspirations of Americans.

No individuals or groups should be neglected; all should be included, whatever their racial, religious or national origin, whether young or old, whether businessmen, or farmers, whether blue-collar workers, white-collar workers, or professional people.

Every American has not only the right—but the duty—to participate in shaping the destiny of our American society.

It is in dedication to the realization of these goals that I ask your continued assistance. With the guidance of Almighty God I swear to serve the people of the State of New York to the best of my ability.

Slave Labor Camps in Sovietized Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter Becher, a distinguished member of the Bavarian Legislature, has asked me to call to the attention of the people of the United States, a descriptive account of the slave labor camps in Sovietized East Germany.

The January 16, 1963, edition of the Bulletin, published under the auspices of the German Federal Government, reviews the brutalities and inhumanities inflicted upon the German people by the Soviet-Communist dominated Ulbricht regime in East Germany.

A condensation of this article follows:

SLAVE CAMPS IN SOVIETIZED GERMANY

Fifteen thousand political prisoners are held under most inhuman conditions in Soviet-Communist occupied Germany.

More than 2,000 political prisoners are held in the Bautzen slave labor camp. These prisoners are part of a planned Sovietized economic production system. It relies upon mass terrorism and a constant replenishment of slave labor to produce slave labor products at a cheap price to fulfill the regime's economic targets.

In the Brandenburg prison, there are 2,000 prisoners. More than 80 percent of them have been sentenced not for crimes but for political disobedience. The warden

A1116

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 4

of this prison is Major Ackermann. He is notorious for his criminal sadistic ill-treatment of prisoners. These prisoners are exploited to produce parts for the "people's tractor works."

More than 1,000 prisoners are confined in the Torgau prison; more than 2,000 in the Waldheim labor prison.

Thousands of East German citizens are imprisoned in Halle, Erfurt, Magdeburg, and Butzow-Dreibergen.

The women's prison on Barnim Street in East Berlin contains thousands of women and children who are suspected of preparing to escape or have otherwise failed to wholly accept the Communist political dogma.

The children of political prisoners are taken from the parents and are often commingled with juvenile delinquents and subnormal children. The children's prisons are located in Kipsdorf, Hummelshain, Konigsstein and Wismar.

Many of the political prisoners are imprisoned without judicial hearings or court sentences. The Communist Party officials are authorized to send uncooperative citizens to slave labor camps for "labor training", without trial. Political penal labor camps are located at Rudersdorf, Rostock, Lubben I and Lubben II.

The common political infractions of these political prisoners are an expressed refusal to accept the Ulbricht Communist regime, or an expressed belief in the reunification of Germany.

Mass fear psychosis, combined with slave labor and the deprivation of freedom, in Soviet-Communist occupied Germany is still a stark sad reality.

The time has come for the United Nations to expose and focus world opinion on the barbaric treatment of political noncooperative citizens in Sovietized East Germany. Our U.S. representatives to the United Nations should take the initiative in compelling a full disclosure and exposure of the barbaric punishment inflicted upon innocent citizens, simply for their failure to fully cooperate politically with the Soviet puppet regime of Ulbricht.

The British Medical System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Callanan recently made a speech before the public health section of the Commonwealth Club of California.

Dr. Callanan is now a practicing surgeon in San Francisco. He is a graduate of the University College of Dublin and practiced 9 years under the British medical system, of which time he spent 7 years as a hospital surgeon.

Excerpts from his remarks as published by the Commonwealth Club of California appear as follows:

WHEN ENGLISHMAN REALLY SICK, HE SEEKS PRIVATE PRACTITIONER

"It is not true that 85 percent of British doctors and patients are satisfied with socialized medicine," Dr. John Callanan said addressing the club's public health section (Dr. Frank Stiles, chairman) on British socialized medicine. He continued:

"Bevin recognized that the economic strength of private medicine was based upon the right of the private physician to

sell or pass on his practice to a successor. So, by striking out this right, he took away the independence of the medical profession.

"Bevin ignored the average practitioner, but set the older doctors up for life and promised younger doctors 1,000 pounds a year. With the backing of these two groups, Bevin split the medical profession to get what he wanted.

"The second thing he did was to make private doctors too much of an expense for most people to afford. Only 5 percent of the total population, at last reports, were employing their own doctors.

"However, today, when people in Britain feel they have something seriously wrong with them they usually get a private practitioner, or ask for a consultation.

"Medicine there is now conducted by a group which makes rules, from which there is no appeal—unless a patient wishes to go to the national director of medicine, or through the courts, a very expensive and time-consuming process. Even then, one doctor, to cite a famous instance, carried his case clear to the House of Lords and got the case reversed; but, despite this official decision, 18 months later the doctor had not been reinstated.

"Except as to insurance examinations, a doctor is not permitted to do more than one type of work. It is illegal to transfer from one of the three general types of medical practice to another—from hospital practice to general practice, for example.

"When a patient, who has not been treated by his own private practitioner while in the hospital, leaves the hospital and returns to the care of his own practitioner, necessary information on what has happened to the patient while in the hospital may not reach his personal doctor for weeks.

"The young doctor is faced by uncertainty as to what will happen to him at the end of each year's contract—until he has achieved a status, and thereby perhaps obtained a 2-, 3-, 4-, or even a 6-year contract.

"One result is that (as there are not now enough full-time consultants to handle the work) young doctors (and also doctors past middle age who have not obtained the economic status to which they are entitled) are used for advanced services, but only paid for less important work than that which they actually handle. There are several hundred doctors between 40 and 60 who are underpaid.

"There is today a high percentage of foreign medical students being trained in Britain and later given important hospital positions. In some British cities over half the doctors are from India, Pakistan, and Mediterranean countries. In this employment of foreign doctors, Western Germany has the same problem as England."

No Peace With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see that the growing menace of Communist Cuba finally has penetrated the Washington Post's Ivy towers. One of the most unyielding advocates of a soft international policy, the Post this morning ran as its lead editorial a realistic appraisal of the role the United States must assume in the Cuban situa-

tion. Since this newspaper often serves as advance man for administration action, this may be a welcome harbinger of a tougher U.S. approach to an increasingly tough and dangerous problem.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

NO PEACE WITH CUBA

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. That is the meaning of the events of the past week—whether they relate to disclosures of Cuba's role in training subversive forces in neighboring countries or to the movement of Soviet personnel from Cuban ports. No one will ever be sure how much subversion is going on and, in spite of the efficacy of aerial surveillance, no one can be certain how large are the remaining Soviet forces.

The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace. The threat to the security and peace will rise and fall as their own precautions are extended or contracted. There is every present indication that no country can afford to allow its guard to relax.

As long as Cuba remains a center from which Communist infiltration is carried on, it cannot expect the United States or any of its other neighbors to make any firm pledge against the invasion of Cuba. The day may arrive when these belligerent operations will reach a level of military significance to which there will be no appropriate response but military operations. To make sure that this pitch of activity is not achieved in total secrecy the scrutiny of operations on the island must be maintained at the highest level.

The Western Hemisphere must live in danger while this situation persists. The precautions necessary to contain this threat are so onerous, disagreeable, and unsettling that the United States will be under continuous pressure to take arms against this "sea of trouble" and end it. Were there any assurance that it could indeed be ended by extreme measures, it would be harder to resist such counsels. There is, however, no assurance that even this dangerous alternative would end the crisis. It might only start a greater crisis.

There is no easy escape from the Cuban nuisance. There is no present alternative to the maintenance of a high state of readiness for extreme action, a continuous scrutiny of Cuban measures for signs of increasing hostility, an unremitting readiness to defend any threatened country in the hemisphere. All that we can be sure of for the moment is that as long as this regime lasts, there can be no real peace.

Talk Doesn't Impress Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the niceties of diplomatic language, many Americans believe that our spokesmen should speak in unmistakable terms about our determination to resist Communist aggression and Communist inroads into the Western Hemisphere. In fact many of us believe that we are courting disaster when we do not make our will in these matters clearly and explicitly known. Many a tragedy has re-

sulted because an aggressor miscalculated the strength and determination of another country.

If we cannot give a forthright statement of our position, then we are inviting the Communists to nibble away at the free world, ending eventually in the disaster of total war or the disaster of total surrender. Plain speaking, in other words, is an important weapon in maintaining the peace.

In this connection the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star reflects the thinking of a great many Americans:

TALK DOESN'T IMPRESS REPS

One of the reasons Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev continues to be bombastic is that he finds more talk than action in American policy, and even the talk is often unconvincing.

His experience with the Cuba blockade crisis cannot have changed Khrushchev's belief very much. On the contrary it must have strengthened his estimate of American cold war determination. President Kennedy talked a good blockade. But the actual action turned out to be pretty mild.

The President talked tough demands. But he settled quite eagerly much less than demanded. What's more he accepted Moscow and Havana announcements and some staged evidence as adequate demonstration that the comprised demands had been met.

Now Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has made a declaration which is widely interpreted as a new warning to Khrushchev not to embark on any military combat adventures in Cuba, not even merely to help Fidel Castro put down an internal revolt. But on close examination McNamara's statement is more weak than strong.

What he said in answer to a question about help to quell a revolt, was this: "I think that this administration indicated before that we will not accept combat operations by Soviet military personnel in this hemisphere."

This statement really skirted the question rather than answering it directly and strongly. It would have been much more effective if the secretary had managed to overlook his feeling that the question was repetitious, and had made an unequivocal statement that any military action by the Soviets would be opposed with military force. At least there then would need be no doubt as to what was meant.

Khrushchev indulges in this sort of play with words, too. His recent speech which was interpreted as a bellicose promise to leap to the defense of Cuba with a nuclear assault against America did not really say that at all. He just promised to "come to the aid" of Cuba, without directly specifying the kind of aid. But he did it in such a way as to encourage a leap to the conclusion that he was talking about a nuclear world war.

Because of the very fact that Khrushchev uses this propaganda technique for his own purposes, it is important that the United States speak more directly and more exactly. It is most dangerous to leave Khrushchev room to assume that Washington officials are making the same kind of subtly hedged promises—leaving the same kind of room for backing away—as he does.

The reason for the striking initial success of the Cuba blockade was that a first it seemed to be a blunt and clear action which left no room for misunderstanding of American intent. The reason that initial success collapsed into a very dubious "victory" was that as the action progressed the clearness of intent soon gave way to the old wavering and cautious dithering.

America needs a clear and unequivocal stand, expressed in terms that cannot be misunderstood.

Davenport's Voice Gives Pleasure to Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be amazed by the vitality and areas of interest of some of our senior citizens. To put these people on the shelf when they reach age 60 or 65 is to do them a disservice and to rob their communities of a manpower pool which is ready to tackle anything.

A case in point is Mrs. Agnes Delarue of Davenport, Iowa, who has served as my congressional committeewoman for Scott County, Iowa, since I have been in Congress. Mrs. Delarue will soon be 73. She is of the pioneer stock which first settled Scott County and I would say that next to her family and friends, the welfare and progress of this community with which her family has been associated for over a century are dearest to her heart.

She has given a lifetime of service to the Republican Party, working in those areas where there is not a great deal of glory, only hard work and dedication. They are the areas, however, where elections are won and lost—the precinct levels where voters must be kept informed about the issues and the candidates and motivated to get to the polls.

Besides keeping busy in party politics, Mrs. Delarue is continually finding other things to do so that she can help her fellowman and make his lot easier and more enjoyable. Her latest venture is to make tape recordings for the blind. The Davenport (Iowa) Times recently carried a news account of this activity. With the thought that it may inspire other senior citizens to remain active and use their God-given talents in rewarding tasks, I wish to bring this account to the attention of my colleagues and their constituents. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this story, "Davenport's Voice Gives Pleasure to the Blind," appear in the Appendix of the Record:

DAVENPORT'S VOICE GIVES PLEASURE TO BLIND

(By Keith Prescott)

Small children who live in a world of darkness settle themselves close to the tape recorder at school at Vinton to hear a pleasant voice recite some of the stories dear to the very young.

The voice belongs to Mrs. Agnes C. Delarue of 1229 Scott Street, Davenport, who spends many hours a day in her home making tape recordings of books chosen for use of the blind by either the Vinton School or the Library of Congress.

This fascinating job of recording such favorite children's works as "Stories of Iowa for Boys and Girls," by Mahan & Gallagher is carried on by Mrs. Delarue and many other Iowans as a local project of the Temple Emanuel Sisterhood.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Mrs. Delarue, who is one of the city's most active Republican Party workers, was auditioned by the Sisterhood for the position which brings many hours of pleasure to the blind.

A recording of her voice was forwarded to the Library of Congress in Washington where officials appeared very pleased with the results.

A tape recorder was sent to Mrs. Delarue by the Iowa Commission for the Blind in Des Moines along with a supply of tape and three children's books to be used for her first assignment.

"THE POTOMAC"

The Library of Congress recently sent Mrs. Delarue "The Potomac," one of the Rivers of America series, for recording on tape for use of the blind in the national library.

Mrs. Delarue who has not yet started the task of recording the lengthy volume, believes the project may require at least four of the large 1,800-foot tapes she uses in her unusual work.

Said Mrs. Delarue of the nonpaying task she has undertaken for the benefit of the blind: "This gives me an opportunity to really demonstrate my love for children and for those who have to depend on a little help from others."

Mrs. Delarue, who is approaching her 73d birthday, has been a Republican precinct committeewoman for 41 years.

She also serves as congressional committeewoman for Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Davenport and assists the Congressman in interviewing candidates for the academics.

The School Prayer Decision: Where Is It Taking Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of March 3, 1963:

THE SCHOOL PRAYER DECISION: WHERE IS IT TAKING US?

(NOTE.—A discussion of the Supreme Court decision in the school prayer case last year and its implications on all traces of religion in public activities was contained in an address Thursday by Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard University Law School. He was delivering the William H. Leary lecture at the University of Utah Law School. From the speech the Star has extracted passages to show the heart of his argument.)

An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court (as people have always done in the past, and should continue to do in the future), it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential task. It is in that spirit that my remarks are offered.

A TEXT CITED

A number of years ago I saw in the Saturday Review a little item which may serve as a text for my remarks.

It reads as follows: "In the land of Absolute, where everyone and everything is perfect, there is no light at night."

"The annals of the Absolutists record that they once discovered the electric light, but as is known, the perfect electric light burns in a perfect vacuum."

"Absolute is in the dark."

Absolutes are likely to be phantoms, eluding our grasp. Even if we think we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and useful thought—in law, as in other fields of human knowledge. I would like to suggest that the Supreme Court has, in recent years, been engaged in certain types of cases, in a species of absolutism in its reasoning, which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. It is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging.

The most extreme form of the absolutist position has been taken by Mr. Justice Black, particularly in certain extrajudicial pronouncements. Thus, in his James Madison lecture at New York University, he said: "It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be absolutes."

And he reiterated this, and extended it in a publicized interview in which he dealt specifically with the first amendment, which you will recall, reads in the following terms: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Justice Black lays great stress on the words "no law" in the opening phrase which says: "Congress shall make no law." Just to make it clear that he would not be misunderstood, he went on to say that laws about libel and slander are invalid. And he added: "I have an idea there are some absolutes. I do not think I am far in that respect from the Holy Scriptures."

THE NEW YORK CASE

Within the last year, a case came before the Supreme Court which directly involved the interpretation and application of the first amendment. This was the New York school prayer case. Its name is *Engel v. Vitale*. It involved a prayer formulated by the State Board of Regents in New York, and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State. The prayer, in its entirety, was as follows:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, held that the reciting of this prayer in the public schools of New York violated the Constitution. It was, the Court held, an "establishment of religion," forbidden by the first amendment. Five of his colleagues joined with him. Mr. Justice Stewart dissented. Justice Douglas wrote a concurring opinion which, though differing some in his reasoning, showed the absolutist approach. He recounted all the ways in which governmental bodies now finance some activity with a religious element or overtone: "Chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services"; "compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services . . . in Federal hospitals and prisons"; "religious prohibitions" by the President; "In God We Trust" on our money; "Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia"; and many other things, including exemption from "the Federal income tax" and "postal privileges" for "religious organizations." All of this is bad, according to Justice Doug-

las. After recognizing that "Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with" such things, he said, summarily, and absolutely: "Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." It's as simple as that. They are all bad. And perhaps they are if the absolutist approach to such matters can be accepted as sound. These are the lengths to which absolutism takes us.

LOOK AT THE WORDING

But is it all as clear as this? Do words convey such positive and overpowering meaning? Is there no room whatever for thought or consideration? Perhaps it would be worth while just to look carefully at the words of the first amendment, in all its majesty. I will not yield to any Justice of the Supreme Court in my respect for those words, or, in my conception of their importance not merely in our history but in their present function and worth in helping us to preserve a free Nation. But what do they say? "Congress shall make no law . . ."

Congress had made no law in the Engel case; no law of Congress was in any way involved.

What is it that Congress can make no law about? It is "an establishment of religion." What does that term mean? That takes some construing, too. Certainly there was much history behind the phrase. Not only did England (and Scotland) have an established church, but there were established churches in a number of the States at the time the first amendment was adopted. And they were something very different from a regents' recommended prayer. It takes a measure of construction to bring this prayer within the no-establishment clause. "No law" may well mean no law.

But "establishment of religion" might mean establishment of religion; and those who wrote the "establishment of religion" clause might be rather perplexed by the use which has been made of it in 1962. "No law" means no law. It is as simple as that—that is, if one ignores the other words which are involved in the task, such as "Congress," "establishment of religion," "the free exercise thereof," and "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not say that these are meaningless words. I do suggest they are words which require construction, which are by no means absolute in form or content, and that to ignore them under the guise of the absolutist approach is to fail to recognize and perform the most significant and fundamental part of the task of judging.

UNFORTUNATE MOVE

Let me now turn to another aspect of the matter. I think it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the Court decided the case, one way or the other, and that this unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the Court has taken.

What do I mean by this? I have in mind at least two separate lines of thought. One is the fact that we have a tradition, a spiritual and cultural tradition, of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution itself, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect. The other is that there are some matters which are essentially local in nature, important matters, but nonetheless matters to be worked out by the people themselves in their own communities, when no basic rights of others are impaired.

First, as to the long tradition. Is it not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian nation? Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchinson, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and

many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian nation, having developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

PROVISIONS OF SWEEP

It is perfectly true that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These are great provisions, of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: Chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces, chapels in prisons, "In God We Trust" on our money, to mention only a few. Must all of these things be rigorously extirpated in order to satisfy a constitutional absolutism?

Does our deep-seated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the Founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach to the problem.

MATTERS FOR COMMUNITIES

Now let me turn to the other point—that there are some matters which should be settled on the local level, in each community, and should not become great Supreme Court cases. The prayer involved in the Engel case was not compulsory. As the Supreme Court itself recited, no pupil was compelled "to join in the prayer over his or his parents' objection." This, to me, is crucial. If any student was compelled to join against his conviction, this would present a serious and justiciable question, akin to that presented in the flag salute case. The Supreme Court did not give sufficient weight to this fact, in my opinion, and relied heavily on such things as the history of the Book of Common Prayer, which, under various acts of Parliament, was compulsory on all.

COMMUNITY DETERMINATION

Where there is no compulsion, what happens if these matters are left to the determination of each community? In New York, this determination was made by the elected authorities of the school district. It was, indeed, a fact that a large number of the school districts in New York did not adopt the so-called regents' prayer. Where such a decision was reached, there can surely be no constitutional objection on the ground that it was a decision locally arrived at, or that it amounts to an establishment of "no religion." But, suppose that in a particular school district, as in New Hyde Park, it was determined that the prayer should be used as a part of the opening exercises of the school day. Remember that it is not compulsory. No pupil is compelled to participate. Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? This would suggest that no school can have a pledge of allegiance to the flag if any student does not wish to join.

This is a country of religious toleration. That is a great consequence of our history embodied in the first amendment. But does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This is a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of

AN ANSWER FROM ABROAD

One of the more fashionable ideas around Washington of late has been the doctrine that the tremendous postwar recovery of Europe has been due to the comparatively large deficit-financing of nations like France and West Germany.

The popularity of this doctrine is understandable. It would provide a nice rationalization for the still bigger U.S. Government deficits which, from the looks of things, we are going to get anyway. What better retort to stubborn objectors than to be able to say, See what wonderful things big deficits did for the prosperity of Europe?

Well, the doctrine is neither factually accurate nor logically persuasive, but because of the differences between U.S. and European bookkeeping its advocates have been able to muddy up the waters. So it's useful now to have one of the leading bankers of West Germany inject some refreshing clarity into the discussion.

Speaking for his own country, Dr. Hermann Abs, managing director of Frankfurt's Deutsche Bank, told the American Bankers Association convention that for the past decade "neither the Federal nor the state budgets were in deficit positions—whatever accounting methods one might apply. On the contrary, there were often surpluses instead, and yet Germany had one of the most outstanding rates of economic growth within Europe between the years 1959 and 1960."

So much for the alleged fact that the Germans did all they did by virtue of virtuous deficits. To what, then, can one attribute West Germany's phenomenal growth record?

Dr. Abs is no simple-minded man in search of a single answer. He notes many contributing factors, from the U.S. aid extended to West Germany after the war to the restraint exercised by trade unions (refreshing thought there, too) in their demands for higher wages unrelated to productivity. He gives credit, too, to government planning and assistance.

But it was government planning with a difference. A decade ago the German Government granted special depreciation allowances to basic industries for investment purposes. Special tax measures were adopted for industrial concerns, including a substantial reduction in corporation taxes on distributed profits.

Meanwhile, says Dr. Abs, "the credit policy of the Central Bank in those years was extremely conservative and restricted." And he adds that "if there had been deficit spending in Germany at that time, most likely excessive price increases, on all fronts like those in the subsidized building or housing sector, would not have been avoidable."

If this correlation of a "conservative and restricted" money policy with rapid economic growth seems shocking to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, they must be even more stunned by Dr. Abs' account of what happened when Germany did briefly flirt with more liberal policies.

By 1960 Germany had gotten so prosperous it was embarrassing and had brought on the problem of a surplus in its balance of payments. So the Government lowered interest rates, revalued the mark and "instead of slowing down Government spending" increased it to a peak—partly, Dr. Abs suggests, to help the government win an election, a thing not unheard of in this country.

All this was a "fundamental mistake" and the result was a slowdown in the growth rate, a decline in the profit margins of industry with a consequent drop in new investments and new difficulties for German industries in foreign trade.

Dr. Abs said his knowledge was "too limited" to inject himself into the U.S. argument about the virtues of deficit financing. But for Americans less inhibited about their conclusions from the German experience,

he did offer the lesson of his own country. "Deficit spending," he said, "if applied during the period of 1950 to 1960, would have prevented the German economy to grow as it did grow."

We hope the Council of Economic Advisers was listening.

Cuba

"The United Nations in Crisis: Cuba and the Congo"—An Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Before the 1963 Mid-Atlantic Model General Assembly, Washington, D.C., February 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address by Richard N. Gardner, the able Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, which was delivered before the Mid-Atlantic Model General Assembly held at Washington, D.C., on February 23, 1963.

The text of Mr. Gardner's address follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS IN CRISIS: CUBA AND THE CONGO

I don't know which group causes us the most trouble in Washington these days—the uncritical admirers of the United Nations or the uncritical opponents of the United Nations.

When I say uncritical admirers of the United Nations, I mean those people who are always writing us to say: "Naughty boys—you have bypassed the U.N." They want the United Nations to do everything.

These people remind me of the tribal chief who came to the General Assembly some years ago to complain that the British were oppressing him because they would not let him keep his 100 wives. One veteran U.N. delegate rose in his full dignity and said: "This is not a fit subject for the United Nations. Let this man keep his 100 wives—and let the ravages of nature teach him the error of his ways."

The uncritical opponents of the United Nations are those who are never satisfied no matter what the U.N. does. I have in mind one critic who wrote me 3 months ago to say that the United Nations was a failure because it was too weak to deal with Tshombe. Now he is writing to complain that the U.N. is too strong and has become a "superstate."

Like the uncritical admirers, the uncritical opponents of the U.N. feel under no obligation to base their opinions on facts. As Stephen Leacock said: "It's not what people don't know that causes all the trouble, it's what they do know that ain't so."

We in Washington try to steer a course between these two extremes. We look upon the United Nations in a hard and practical way as a means of promoting our national self-interest. This statement should not shock anyone, because this is the way that other countries look upon the United Nations—as

a means of promoting their own national self-interest.

The United Nations is not a substitute for national interest, but rather a place where nations work together to promote their national interests on those matters where they cannot get adequate results by acting alone.

These general observations are familiar to you. Let us test them in two of the great crises of the last year: Cuba and the Congo.

THE CUBAN CRISIS

The Cuban crisis was a particularly eloquent illustration of the U.N.'s threefold value to the United States as a place for debate, negotiation, and action—once the power and determination of the United States and its allies had been demonstrated in the quarantine.

As a place for debate, the United Nations enabled us to build support for our Cuban policy in the most dramatic and effective way. You will all remember what Mr. Zorin said before millions on TV—that the Soviets had no need to put missiles into Cuba and that the U.S. evidence of the missile sites was manufactured by the CIA. We countered by showing pictures of the missile sites in the Security Council. Shortly thereafter Khrushchev admitted the presence of the missiles and agreed to withdraw them.

This public exposure of Soviet duplicity had a tremendous impact in building support for the quarantine and other aspects of our Cuban policy. Even though the Cuban matter was considered in the Security Council, it affected the course of the General Assembly and turned the general opinion of mankind in our favor on a number of other subjects. We could not have achieved this result with anything like such success if we had been obliged to show our pictures and tell our story separately in 109 different countries.

As a place for negotiation, the United Nations was scarcely less important to us. The Secretary-General served as a useful go-between in negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

To begin with he helped avoid an armed clash at sea between the Soviets and ourselves when he proposed that Soviet ships stay clear of our quarantine fleet. If the Soviets needed an out, they could find it in responding to a U.N. appeal, and not admitting publicly they were responding to U.S. power.

As a place for action, the United Nations demonstrated its potential for the future. Khrushchev agreed to U.N. inspection on the spot. He could never have agreed to U.S. inspection. Then Castro refused and branded Communist Cuba as unwilling to cooperate with the world peace organization.

The fact that the United Nations was willing and able to perform the inspection role in Cuba and that this was agreed to between the United States and the Soviet Union had a twofold value: the United Nations demonstrated a potential of considerable importance for the future, and Castro was put in the position of defying not just U.S. inspection but U.N. inspection, thereby leaving inspection to our own resources.

THE CONGO CRISIS

Let us turn now from Cuba to the Congo. Some people still ask: What is the United Nations doing in the Congo and why is the United States supporting it?

To answer this question it is useful to recall the choice that confronted the United States in the Congo in the summer of 1960. The alternatives open to the United States were clear.

We could do nothing—in which case the Congo would wallow in chaos and bloodshed and the Soviet bloc would be free to move in to pick up the remains.

March 4

We could intervene directly—and trigger a confrontation in the heart of Africa of the great powers—a confrontation which could lead to another "Spanish civil war" and be the prelude to a wider conflict.

Or we could do what we in fact did—give assistance to the Congo through the United Nations.

I think the judgment of history will be that the use of the United Nations in the Congo was the least dangerous of the three dangerous alternatives confronting the United States and the world at large in the summer of 1960.

Most Americans recognize the merit of these arguments. Yet a number of specific questions about the Congo are still raised.

LEGALITY OF U.N. ACTION IN CONGO

Some people ask: Was the United Nations action in the Congo legal? The answer is yes, for three reasons:

First, the Government of the Congo asked for the United Nations to come in.

Second, the Security Council authorized the U.N. to go in with a mandate to maintain law and order—a mandate which was subsequently expanded into a mandate to prevent civil war, protect the Congo's territorial integrity, and remove the foreign mercenaries.

Third, the military actions of the U.N. force were taken in pursuit of these mandates and in self-defense.

It is well to remember that the recent fighting which culminated in the end of the secession of Katanga began on Christmas eve when drunken Katangese soldiers attacked a U.N. command post. This was the culmination of a long series of harassments of the U.N. soldiers designed to cut them off from one another and from their supplies and communications.

I think it is a generally accepted principle of both domestic and international law that a cop who is lawfully on the beat has a right to defend himself against attack.

As a part of this legal question, there are people who ask: Isn't this intervention in the internal affairs of the Congo? The answer is no again, for at least two reasons:

First, the Congo asked for the U.N. to come in.

Second, this was not an internal matter—there was a clear threat to international peace and security because of the actual or potential involvement of outside powers.

Still other people ask: Doesn't this violate traditional United States support for the principle of self-determination? The answer is no, for at least three reasons:

First, there is no absolute principle of self-determination. We fought a civil war to deny it. We have recognized both at home and abroad the dangers of Balkinization. Suppose the mayor of a Texas town which happened to have most of the oil in Texas decided to secede from the State and take the oil with him. I don't suppose that would be permitted by the people of Texas or by the people of the United States. The application of the principle of self-determination in the Congo without any qualification would mean the creation of some 20 tribal states and the disintegration of the whole into disorder and chaos.

Second, even according to the standards of self-determination, Tshombe could not pretend to speak for the Katanga. As you know, he was the leader of the Lunda tribe, one of several tribes in Katanga. The Lundas are a minority in numbers and occupy less than half of the land area of Katanga. Tshombe is strongly opposed by the Baluba tribe in the north. In the only popular election in Katanga, his party gained only 25 seats in a 60-seat assembly. The parliamentary group which supported him during the last 2 years was a rump parliament lacking full Baluba representation. We may also note that the United Nations forces were

greeted with open arms when they entered Jadotville and Kolwezi in the heart of Tshombe's tribal area.

Third, Tshombe was estopped from pleading the principle of self-determination when he agreed to accept a single Congolese state. He did this at the Brussels roundtable conference of January 1960, before the Belgians left. He has done it on numerous occasions since. He did it as recently as last fall when he accepted the conciliation plan of the United Nations.

THE CONGO AND MISSISSIPPI

There are people who will concede all these things but say: "Very well, but where will this United Nations business stop? Isn't the Congo a precedent for the U.N. going into Mississippi?"

The answer is "No" again, for three reasons:

First, we would not ask the United Nations to come into Mississippi.

Second, if others insisted on bringing the U.N. into Mississippi, we could prevent this from getting the necessary votes.

Third, by no stretch of the imagination can the situation in Mississippi be regarded as a threat to international peace and security.

Finally, there are those who are satisfied on these legal and moral questions, but ask: "Wouldn't our national interest have been served better by supporting Tshombe?" The answer is "No" because—

The central government under Adoula is moderate and pro-Western.

Tshombe supporters have been working with the leftists to destroy the central government.

Tshombe had no support in black Africa and very little anywhere else. No country has ever recognized Katanga separatism.

The secession of Katanga under Tshombe would have ended moderate government in the Congo and would have precipitated the disintegration of the country into tribal groupings with maximum opportunity for the Communists to come in.

In short, the efforts of Tshombe to set up a separate regime in Katanga played into the hands of communism.

Now the military phase of the U.N. operation in the Congo has passed. The phase of nation building has begun. A U.S. mission to the Congo under Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, has just returned with proposals for the economic reconstruction of the Congo under U.N. auspices. In the economic tasks ahead for the Congo the United Nations could play a role which no single nation could play alone without compromising Congolese independence and making the Congo a subject of cold war controversy.

U.N. SPECIAL FUND AND CUBA

The moral of this story is not that the United Nations is perfect. Indeed, there are a number of things that are done at the U.N. with which we do not agree. During the last 2 weeks we have had a dramatic illustration of this in the decision of the U.N. Special Fund to proceed—albeit on a tentative basis—with an agricultural research project in Cuba.

This project was approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund in May 1961. It calls for an allocation of \$1,157,000 from the Special Fund to assist in the expansion of an agricultural experimental station in Santiago de la Vegas.

The U.S. Government did everything consistent with the U.N. Charter to oppose this project. We oppose any source of aid and comfort to the Castro regime. We argued that special fund assistance to Cuba at this time could not be justified under the economic and technical criteria of the Special Fund's charter. In view of the chaos in Cuban agriculture which has resulted from the application of Communist tech-

niques and the subordination of the economic and social welfare of the Cuban people to the narrow political aims of the Castro regime.

Our arguments, I am sorry to say, did not receive the necessary support in the Governing Council. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Managing Director of the Fund, concluded that he had no choice but to proceed with the project on a tentative basis. In the next few months he will send several experts to determine whether or not conditions in Cuba will permit the project to proceed and it is possible that the actual operation of the project will not go forward when representatives of the Fund have the opportunity to take an up-to-date reading of conditions on the spot.

The Special Fund project in Cuba is an example of a U.N. action with which we do not agree. But it is well in these matters to keep our eyes on the big picture. The Special Fund, like all U.N. economic agencies, is prohibited by its charter from making decisions on political grounds. The failure of other U.N. members to support us in our opposition to the Cuban project came not out of any solicitude for Cuba but out of the fear that stopping this project would jeopardize other projects to which the Soviet Union and other countries have objected. The special fund has 11 projects totaling \$7.5 million in Korea, Vietnam, and free China which the Soviets do not like—and which are being carried out today despite their misgiving.

The fact is that the U.N. Special Fund has been a great asset to the free world through its efforts to promote the material basis for free institutions. Even on the narrowest of political calculations the free world has got more out of the Special Fund than it has put in, while the reverse is true of the Communist bloc.

The bloc countries have contributed some \$7 million to the Special Fund; with this project in Cuba added to two previous projects in Poland they will have received \$3 million in return. If you add Yugoslavia, Communist contributions add up to \$8 million, projects in Communist countries to \$6 million. Out of the 288 Special Fund projects so far authorized, 282 have been in non-Communist countries. In financial terms, some \$248 million of the grand total of \$254 million of Fund projects—over 97 percent—go to the non-Communist world.

It would be tragic if our dissatisfaction with the project in Cuba were to destroy our support for the Special Fund. It would be the height of folly to sacrifice the 97 percent of its work we do like for the 3 percent we do not like. We do not bench a baseball player who is batting .970, nor fire a football coach because he loses one game in thirty.

The price of participating in any political institution is that you cannot get your way all of the time. We cannot expect to get our way all of the time in the United Nations. There will be entries on the debit as well as on the credit side of the ledger. The central question is whether the credits exceed the debits—whether looking at the balance sheet as a whole the institution is making a net contribution to our national interest. The U.S. Government continues to believe that the answer to that question is overwhelmingly in the affirmative.

TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

Let me stress once again, however, that we are not entirely satisfied with the United Nations. We want to make it better.

In specific terms, we want to—

Strengthen the independence of the Secretariat against the attacks of the Soviet Union who have never accepted article 100 in principle or in practice.

Improve the method of financing peace-keeping operations and make defaulting members pay up.

Increase the efficiency of the U.N.'s economic and social work, particularly through more effective coordination of the specialized agencies.

Strengthen the U.N.'s capacity to settle future disputes—first, through preventive diplomacy to keep disputes from erupting into violence and, second, through peace-keeping actions to contain those disputes from widening into a global conflict.

In this last ambition, we must learn from the Congo experience to strengthen the U.N.'s future peacekeeping operations. We must improve the training, supply, financing, intelligence, public relations, and command and control of U.N. military operations.

We want to do these latter things not only for their own sake but as a means of promoting general and complete disarmament. For the fact is that nations will never be willing to eliminate or even radically reduce their arms until they have some substitute means of protecting their territorial integrity and defending their vital interest.

In an age when the Soviet Union and the United States have in their arsenals weapons each of which have the destructive power of all the bombs dropped in the Second World War, in an age when we face the prospect that no matter how many weapons one side might build neither side could escape unimaginable destruction in a nuclear holocaust—in such an age there is no rational alternative but to develop a civilized system of collective security under the aegis of the United Nations.

In Cuba, in the Congo, and elsewhere, the United Nations has acted—in the words of a distinguished commentator—not as a world superstate, but as a world public utility. If it did not exist, it would have to be invented.

GOP Economy Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the first newspaper comments on the Republican appropriations committee task force to reduce the Federal budget is an excellent column by Peter Edson which I wish to include with my remarks.

As Mr. Edson points out, we hope to have the support of economy-minded Members from both sides of the aisle, for we hope that the citizens generally and the Members of Congress are not divided along partisan lines when they view with apprehension the constant increase in Government spending.

The Edson article follows:

GOP Economy Drive

(By Peter Edson)

Spearhead for the Republican drive to cut from \$10 to \$15 billion from President Kennedy's \$108 billion budget for next year is Representative FRANK T. Bow, of Canton, Ohio, and other GOP members of the House Appropriations Committee.

Representative Bow and his group will operate under Republican congressional leaders but they will seek support for their budget cutting from economy-minded Democrats. Republicans realize they can't succeed

in this operation without Democratic votes. But they played this coalition crisscross game in cutting Truman administration budgets in the 80th Congress and they think they can do it again.

If the Republicans and their Democratic kindred spirits can make major cuts in next year's budget, they believe it will help justify the tax cut both parties want. But the President's tax reform program is left out of the operation.

Maurice Stans, President Eisenhower's last Budget Bureau Director, has done the research job and compiled the figures which will be used as basis for the Republican-planned cuts. Mr. Stans will not take an active part in the operation but stay in the background as an adviser.

During the past month or so he has been commuting from his Los Angeles home to Washington while making an item-by-item and line-by-line analysis of the Kennedy budget.

Cutting the President's request for \$108 billion in new obligatory authority by from \$10 to \$15 billion would mean an \$83 to \$98 billion new obligatory authority. The resulting cut in spending for the year beginning next July 1 would be from \$4 to \$6 billion. This would make an administrative expenditure budget of from \$93 to \$95 billion in place of the President's \$99 billion.

Possible economies suggested by Mr. Stans do not represent an across-the-board percentage cut. Reductions are considered possible for every major item in the budget, however, including even national defense and exploration of our outer space.

While no figures have been given out, it is believed that defense cuts will be sought at a little lower percentage figure than for most of the civilian agencies. For smaller agencies, where cuts of less than \$500,000 are considered possible, they are indicated as nominal and no great effort will be made to pare them down.

The space program would definitely be cut back so as to slow down the program and bring it under tighter, more efficient control. The expressed idea is to take the frenzy out of the present crash program. The \$40 billion estimated total cost of putting men on the moon would remain. Whether the mission would be accomplished by 1970 or maybe 1975 isn't considered important.

One of the points Republicans are emphasizing in planning these cuts is that they will not result in an austere budget.

Their idea is to stop budget growth for a few years and stabilize expenditures so that the economy can catch up. If this isn't done, Republicans say the budget won't be balanced for years.

They point out that President Eisenhower submitted an \$81 billion new obligatory authority budget for fiscal 1962. President Kennedy's \$108 billion budget for 1964 is a 34-percent increase in 2 years.

"What we need," says one Republican, "is an adding machine on the President's desk so he can keep track of the cost of all the new programs he is asking for."

The Republicans want to stop nonemergency public works and put a moratorium on new projects not essential to security. Government construction—\$7 billion in 1962 is estimated at \$9 billion for 1964 under the Kennedy budget.

Government civilian employment would be cut back by the GOP economy drive, but it is said this will not endanger national security or public welfare. The idea is to cut the planned 500,000 increase of Government personnel from 2.5 to 2.7 million military and 2.3 to 2.6 million civilians by June 30, 1964.

Cessna's Important Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Cessna Aircraft Co., of Wichita, Kans., last week achieved an important milestone in its history when it delivered its 50,000th airplane. It is appropriate that we recognize the achievements of this aircraft company for it has grown into the world's largest manufacturer of business, pleasure and utility aircraft in the true American tradition of free enterprise.

It was Clyde V. Cessna, a farmer-mechanic from Kansas, who founded this company in 1927. Cessna built his first airplane in 1911 and for the next 16 years barnstormed through the Midwest, making constant modifications on his original aircraft during the off seasons.

From this modest beginning, Cessna has grown to its place of prominence in the American aviation industry. Dwane L. Wallace became president and general manager of the company in 1936. Only one other firm in the Nation has had a total production of more than 50,000 aircraft.

In addition to its prominent role in the private plane market, Cessna has made important contributions to the military posture of our Nation. During World War II the United States and Royal Canadian Air Forces purchased 5,402 twin-engine T-50 Bobcats and 750 gliders were built by Cessna at its Hutchinson, Kans., plant for the Normandy invasion.

The Korean war again brought Cessna into manufacture of military products. Today it continues to serve as a parts subcontractor for several of this Nation's major weapons systems. The company's military division is producing the twin-jet T-37, which is the first airplane in which the U.S. Air Force student pilots receive flight training; the O-1E—L-19E—liaison-observation plane, more than 3,300 of which have been delivered to the U.S. Army since 1950; and the transporter-erector container for the Minuteman missile.

The Cessna story exemplifies the strength of the free enterprise system in America. It is a story of determined and aggressive effort by both management and employees working together. Hard work and perseverance have resulted in Cessna's prominence in the aircraft industry.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following editorial from the Evening Eagle & Beacon published February 25, 1963:

CESSNA'S IMPORTANT MILESTONE

Behind the announcement that Cessna Aircraft Co., will deliver its 50,000th airplane today is a story of remarkable achievement over the years by a few men who per-

March 4

A1134

asted with their business dreams even when prospects for success were dim.

In 1931 business conditions were bad, for airplane makers as well as everybody else. Clyde Cessna's company was only 4 years old when it had to close its doors; but through 1931, 1932, and 1933 the pioneer Wichita airplane builder and his son, Eldon, talked stockholders into keeping their plant so it could open again when conditions permitted. For a time gliders were built, along with a few experimental planes.

In the mid-1930's, when Dwane Wallace took over ownership and management, the company began its long, uphill climb. By World War II it was ready to perform in a major way for the U.S. war effort, turning out 5,402 T-50 Bobcat twin-engine trainers for the Army Air Corps.

Again, after war production ceased, the future looked dark. From \$70 million in sales in 1943 (all military), the company's sales fell to \$8 million in 1946. So, the company turned to other products, particularly furniture.

But perseverance and hard work kept the company going when others were giving up, and by 1952 the furniture production could be halted, for military and civilian aircraft production again was picking up. Since then, the climb has been steadily upward, until now Cessna is the world's largest producer of aircraft.

Wichitans salute Cessna and Dwane Wallace and all the stockholders and 5,000-plus employees who have reached an important milestone on this day.

Yet, in so doing, we also realize that it is he who lends honor and stature to the award by becoming its first recipient.

The Hungarian-born, naturalized American citizen ranks among the scientific giants of our time. His aerodynamic theories are fundamental to the air age.

As President Kennedy aptly observed in making the award, there is "no one else who so completely represents all areas involved in this medal—science, engineering, and education."

Authorized by Congress in 1959, up to 20 such medals a year can be granted to bestow national honor for outstanding scientific achievement. We are glad to see this channel for recognition begin to be used.

In selecting the much-honored aerodynamicist as the first medalist, the President has marked the award as one of great distinction. Future medalists, even though they may not have the long-established fame of a Von Karman, will know that the standard of achievement for which they are honored is high.

With this precedent established, the White House now should quickly seek out others deserving of the award whether they already have some formal professional recognition or not.

Vigorous yet tasteful use of the authority to grant a number of medals each year would do much to encourage a high level of American scientific endeavor.

thrown out of office at the next election. But the school board here is not responsible for them. Neither is the superintendent. He has pointed time and time again to the desperate needs of the school system. And the school board has given him support. The District Commissioners, it is fair to say, have done what little they can to help. But the truth is they are all helpless.

The blame for the current situation must be laid at the door of a Congress which refused to let the District of Columbia cope with its own problems and refuses at the same time to deal with those problems effectively. Members of the Congress, largely indifferent to District affairs, have allowed the children of this community to be despoiled and cheated—have allowed the House District Committee to treat these children as pawns in a wicked game designed to prove that desegregation cannot succeed.

The evils, inequities, and inadequacies of the District schools are breeding juvenile delinquency and racial strife and social decay. To discuss local school problems in terms of whether to administer corporal punishment to the victims of these problems is to waste time on an irrelevancy.

The schools are producing troubled children far faster than the rod or whip can subdue them. By withholding from children in desperate need the healing help which modern understanding of childhood could provide, by denying to children from wretchedly deprived homes the kind of teaching that could foster their native gifts, by threatening to crush instead of assuage a rebelliousness the children themselves cannot understand, against conditions they had no share in creating, by offering hostility where only kindness can avail, Washington is generating its own destruction as a community.

The children in Washington's schools are Washington's children. Washington is responsible for them. If they are delinquent, it is the community's delinquency that has helped to make them so. Let us stop trying to punish them for our sins and let us begin instead to demand for them their birthright as Americans.

District of Columbia Schools and Their Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday edition of the Washington Post editorialized on the condition of the public schools in the District of Columbia. I wish to commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SHAME! SHAME! SHAME!

Washington now has before it a full, focused picture of its public schools. The picture is presented in Superintendent Carl Hansen's latest report: "Our Schools and Their Prospects." It is a picture which can be looked at only with bitter shame and consternation and dismay.

The report convicts this community of callous neglect of its children. There is not a category in which the schools are not inadequate to the children's needs. The report is prickly with damning statistics. Forty percent of the elementary school buildings in the system are more than half a century old. Three out of four elementary schoolchildren are in buildings taxed beyond their efficient capacity. There are now 2,648 students on double shifts. More than two-thirds of the elementary students are in classes with more than 30 students, 19,566 in classes of 35 or more. A third of the system's teachers are temporary—that is, not fully qualified. Counselors, clerical help, librarians, psychiatrists, special classroom teachers are tragically lacking throughout the system.

If such conditions were disclosed in any self-governing community, the elected school board responsible for them would be

William Attwood, Ambassador to Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is fortunate in having William Attwood as its Ambassador to Guinea. Guinea, part of French speaking Africa, is a young country. It has had its share of troubles, as any vibrant, new nation does, but it has met those difficulties sensibly and courageously.

The Communists early mounted a drive in Guinea, and for awhile the new government and the forces of moderation in Guinea were in peril. But the Soviets overplayed their hand. Their Communist front runners unmasked themselves and revealed that you don't get Soviet aid without Soviet Communist rule. The Communists underestimated the intelligence of the people of Guinea, and they underestimated the

Noted Scientist Dr. von Karman Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently awarded the new U.S. National Science Medal to Theodore von Karman. Dr. von Karman is a great scientist and one of our most useful citizens. His aerodynamic theories have meant much to the progress of aviation and space exploration. He is particularly revered at Arnold Engineering Development Center, which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and which is one of the Nation's major aerodynamic research centers. Dr. von Karman has contributed much to scientific research at this important Center of the U.S. Air Force. In fact, the Air Force has designated one of its important test facilities as the Von Karman Test Chamber at Arnold Center in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor in a recent editorial has praised Dr. von Karman for his outstanding work and congratulates him on his receipt of the National Science Medal. I join in congratulating Dr. von Karman and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

VON KARMAN SETS A STANDARD

We congratulate Theodore von Karman on receipt of the U.S. new National Science Medal.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1141

father, a native of Italy and one of Garibaldi's first 1,000 soldiers, came to America in 1867. His mother, Mary, who came from Genoa, Italy, was an interpreter at Luzerne County Courthouse for 33 years.

As a boy, Mr. Sordoni worked in the mines as a mule driver. At the age of 17, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as a private in the Coast Artillery from 1904 to 1907.

In 1910, he was married and immediately thereafter started in business for himself with a team of horses borrowed from his father. He worked 12 to 16 hours a day hauling coal, removing ashes, digging cellars, and other small jobs.

Shortly afterward, he became an independent contractor with a small office in Forty Fort. After a time, he got into the electric line construction field and later in building construction, first as Andrew J. Sordoni, contractor, and later as the Sordoni Construction Company.

IN CABINET OF FINE

In 1951, Gov. John S. Fine selected Mr. Sordoni to be secretary of commerce and he remained in that post until 1954. As head of the department of commerce, he was a member of many organizations. He served as chairman of the State planning board, State aeronautics commission, Pennsylvania Industrial and Construction Exposition and Pennsylvania Anthracite Committee. He was also a member of the State athletic commission in 1951.

His interest in the rapidly growing automobile age was awakened in the early 1920's and in those early years he was a staunch advocate of the construction of an adequate highway system. This led to his interest in motor club work of which he was a member since 1919, and since 1924 he had been a director of Wyoming Valley Motor Club. He was president of the club from 1942 to 1954 and was again elected president in 1956.

PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Senator Sordoni became active in the American Automobile Association a number of years ago and became its senior vice president in 1953. He was elected president of the American Automobile Association in 1954 and served until 1956. He was a member of the American Automobile Association finance and investment committee and policy resolutions committee and chairman of its international relations committee. He had been a trustee of the American Automobile Association Safety Foundation since 1947.

He was also a member of the World Touring and Automobile Organization of London, England; former vice president and executive committee member of Federation of Inter-American Automobile Clubs of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and a member of the Antique Automobile Club.

He became a life member of the Pennsylvania Motor Federation executive committee in 1939; was elected a director in 1940 and served as president from 1945 to 1954. He had also been a director of Luzerne County Chapter, Pennsylvania Motor Truck Federation, since 1947.

In 1951, he served as chairman of the Pennsylvania State Cancer Crusade and the same year was honorary chairman of the Luzerne County Heart Fund campaign. He also served on local and State boards of the Crippled Children's Association.

A member of Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club since 1920, he was its president in 1927. During World War II, he served as chairman of the War Production Board for Luzerne County.

He was trustee of the Dr. Leo Spears Chiropractic Sanitarium, Denver, Colo. In May 1957, he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Chiropractic from the National College of Chiropractic, Chicago, Ill.

He was associated with the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of New York City, having been a trustee since 1949, and a vice president since 1955.

He was a director of the U.S. Independent Telephone Association; member of Keystone Chapter, Telephone Pioneer Association, Erie; member of the board of governors of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; member of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association Casualty Insurance Co., Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association Fire Insurance Co.; past director of the State chamber of commerce.

He entered electric and telephone line construction work more than 40 years ago and did work for many of the large utilities. He expanded into the general construction field in 1925. Since then, his firm has become known throughout the country and his equipment can be seen throughout the Northeastern United States.

As Mr. Sordoni's interests broadened, so too did the Sordoni Enterprises, which now include the Sterling Hotels System comprising the Americus and Hamilton Hotels, Allentown; Altamont Hotel, Hazleton; Hotel Sterling, Wilkes-Barre; Montrose Inn, Montrose, and the Arlington Hotel, Binghamton. It also includes the Commonwealth Telephone Co., Harveys Lake Light Co., Sterling Engineering & Manufacturing Co., National Tree Surgeons, Public Service of Pennsylvania, Sterling Farms, and the Andrew J. Sordoni Foundation. In these enterprises he employed an average of 5,000 employees.

He obtained Commonwealth Telephone Co. in 1928, when it had about 6,000 subscribers, old worn-out manual equipment, and an outside plant, badly in need of repair and replacement. Today, Commonwealth has more than 50,000 subscribers and with more than 75 percent of its territory automatic dial operation. It is the 3d largest independent telephone company in Pennsylvania and 30th in size of more than 5,100 independent companies in the Nation.

ELECTED TO STATE SENATE

Active in Republican politics for many years, his first public office was as a Forty Fort councilman. He served from 1912 to 1924, and was president for a time. In 1926, he was elected senator from the 20th senatorial district and held that post until 1938.

A member of First Presbyterian Church, Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Sordoni was a 33d degree Mason. He was a member of Wyoming Lodge 468, F. & A. M.; Dieu le Veut Commandery 45, Knights Templar; Shekinah Royal Arch Chapter 182; Keystone Consistory; Irem Temple, Irem Temple Country Club, Shrine Club of Greater Wilkes-Barre, and the Royal Order of Jesters, Binghamton.

Mr. Sordoni had been active in Harveys Lake affairs for a long period. A director of the Harveys Lake Protective Association since 1925, he served eight terms as president and he was chief of the Daniel C. Roberts Fire Co. from 1925 to 1953.

FLORIDA AFFILIATION

In Florida, Mr. Sordoni took an active part in the civic and fraternal life. His Miami Beach memberships included: Board of governors of Committee of 100; member of Miami Heart Institute, trustee of Miami Beach Taxpayers' Association; board of governors of Surf Club, member of LaGorce Country Club and honorary member of the Tatem Surf Club. He was also a charter member of the Hialeah and the Boca Raton Hotel and Club, Boca Raton.

Bucknell University, of which he had been a trustee since 1928, granted him a doctor of laws degree at its 100th commencement in 1950, while Lafayette College gave him the degree of doctor of humane letters in 1953. He was also a member of Sigma Chi Fraternity at Bucknell.

Senator Sordoni served on the board of trustees of Wilkes College and was elected

second vice chairman of the board in 1960.

He was president of Wyoming Valley Hospital from 1941 to 1954, and had been a director from 1936 to 1954, and a trustee since 1956.

A director of the chamber of commerce since 1918, he was president in 1922-23. He was a member of the Committee of 100, Community Chest Board; former trustee of the YWCA, former director of the Wyoming Valley Veterans Building, Inc., and director of Luzerne County Manufacturers' Association.

He was an honorary member of the Order of Sons of Italy; past honorary trustee, Italian Historical Society of America; member of Second Army Advisory Committee for Luzerne County, Grand Central Art Galleries of New York, Metropolitan Club, New York City; Union League, Philadelphia; Pan American Society of the United States; Pennsylvania Society, New York; TWA Ambassador Club, United Airlines 100,000 Mile Club, Pennsylvania Hotels Association, of which he was a former director; Hotel Greeters of America, Inter-American Hotel Association; director of Pennsylvania National Horse Show.

He was also a member of Skytop Club; POS of A, Kingston; Legion of Honor, Wilkes-Barre District; Franklin Club, Eagles, Elks and Moose, all of Wilkes-Barre.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Feb. 27, 1963]

ANDREW SORDONI, 1887-1963

The death of Andrew J. Sordoni at his winter home in Miami Beach today writes finis to a life that constitutes one of the most exciting success stories the community has known in its long and eventful history, although in a broader sense he will live indefinitely through Sordoni Enterprises and good works that will go on for generations. As in the case of many illustrious figures, his influence will not end with the grave, but will continue as a powerful force for good and as a source of inspiration to contemporaries and to those who will come after them.

The youngest of 12 children, this native son of Nanticoke had no place to go but up when he came into the world under modest circumstances. Although he was lacking in material things, he had two assets he prized above all else—his mother and father. Of them, he once said: "I owe what artistic appreciation I have to my father; and to my mother, I owe the determination to do that which is right."

He idolized his mother who, for 33 years, was a court interpreter in Luzerne County courthouse. From her teachings, his character was molded; from her, he acquired industry and integrity, qualities that were to assert themselves daily in the 76 years that were allotted to him. They were the foundation on which he built his amazing career as an industrialist, philanthropist, and public servant whose interests were international in scope, although the principal impact of his life was felt in greater Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and the United States.

So many things entered into the development of the Andrew Sordoni we knew in the past quarter century that it is not possible to enumerate them all. Perhaps next to his parents, his wife, and close associates, one of the most important factors was a tour of duty with the Army for 3 years. It was there he learned the lessons of discipline and leadership that were to play so important a role in all his activities. The dynamic personality that emerged from the Armed Forces in 1907 was of incalculable value in the ensuing half century.

An organizer and builder, he always shared credit for his success with others.

"It has been the friendships, accomplishments, and comradeship, in whatever we have attempted to do together, that mean so much more to me than any other measure

A1112

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 4

of success," he once told associates. "Men and women, such as you, are the nucleus of organizations and by your example have shown the way others might follow in our footsteps. Any success that we may claim, we've achieved together. That is what has made it all the more worth while."

On another occasion, he observed: "A man is known by the company he keeps and a company by the men it keeps. To me, an ounce of loyalty is worth a pound of cleverness."

Another of the stimulating observations that provided a key to his character was: "My mind is so clear because I change it often. You know, if you have a dollar, and I have a dollar, and we exchange dollars, we still each have a dollar. But, if you have an idea, and I have an idea, and we exchange ideas, we each have two ideas."

Andrew Sordoni never forgot his friends, especially those who gave him a helping hand. His appreciation found expression in many ways, especially in the Sordoni Foundation, one of his pet enterprises; in the State senate and in the cabinet of Governor Pine as secretary of commerce; in his art collection which he shared with the public at Hotel Sterling; and in a multitude of extra curricular activities like the Motor Club, the Wyoming Valley Hospital, and the organizations in which he played a leading role.

The honors that came to him, like doctorates from colleges, the 33d degree from the Masons, and the Brotherhood Award this month, among scores of others, he took in stride, accepting them not so much as recognition but as a challenge.

But why go on? Andrew Sordoni is gone and his community and his country mourn a distinguished son and valiant spirit who left the world a better place than he found it on February 11, 1887, when he was born. The senator's reaction to it all was summed up in these words in commenting on an editorial that appeared in this newspaper on the occasion of his 70th birthday anniversary: "Where, oh where, but in America could this have happened? Most wonderful is our heritage. I am most grateful."

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, Feb. 28, 1953]

THE MARK OF A MAN—ANDREW J. SORDONI
Less than 2 weeks before his passing, Andrew J. Sordoni was one of three distinguished citizens who received the Wyoming Valley Brotherhood Roundtable Award.

Unable to attend under his physician's orders, he sent a note from Florida to his son, Jack, who represented him at the dinner. "Tell them," he wrote, "that this is one of the highest honors ever bestowed me, because it comes from my friends; and in honoring me, they honor my mother and my father."

With these few words, in what was to prove to be his last public utterance, Andrew Sordoni summed up the personal feelings which have characterized his fruitful life—as an organizer, builder, and leader of men.

It was indicative of a long and able career of dedication to pursuits, public and private, which have been indelibly marked with the stamp of his wisdom, initiative, and deep sense of feeling for others, his friends and associates.

Despite all the State, national, and international honors bestowed upon him during his lifetime in spheres of business, civic affairs, social, religious, and education work, Senator Sordoni always took greatest pride when he was singled out at home for distinction.

In 1949, Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club, in naming him Citizen of the Year, presented a plaque with this inscription, which he always treasured:

"Successful in many and varied fields, owner of 15 business enterprises, a leader

in civic, community, State, and national organizations, a farmer of distinction with thousands of acres of one of this Nation's most progressive dairy farms, Andrew Sordoni, above all else, marvelously exemplifies the freedom and opportunity a man is given in this great country of ours."

From humble beginnings to the pinnacle of success as founder of extensive enterprises employing upwards of 5,000 persons, Senator Sordoni remained a human and warm person because as a boy he knew what it was to work long hours for very little but the necessities of life.

He was born in Nanticoke, the youngest of 12 children. His father, Nicholas, a native of Italy, came from a wealthy old family in Venice. Of his mother, Mary, a remarkable and astute woman, the Senator often remarked that her early teachings provided the guiding principles which molded his entire life.

While his senatorship and later, his appointment as secretary of commerce under Governor Pine, highlighted his political career, foremost among his interests had been his deep interest and enthusiastic work on behalf of motorists. This began, as a local pundit once put it, "from time time in his youth when he'd arouse his neighbors in Forty Fort with the roar of his one-cylinder motorcycle as he'd leave for work shortly after daybreak."

Over the years, he served as president of the Wyoming Valley Motor Club and for 8 years of the State body, the Pennsylvania Motor Federation, culminating, in 1955-56, with his ascension as president of the 6-million-member American Automobile Association, which duties carried him on tours of major countries of the world.

Still another side of Senator Sordoni was represented by the Sordoni Foundation, which he established for charitable and educational purposes, and through this has flowed many of his philanthropies, modestly, without public notice.

One of the highlights of his career came with the celebration of the golden anniversary of Sordoni Enterprises, when he stated to his employees: "Our strength, the strength of many, is only as strong as each of us individually. As Americans, opportunities are ours in abundance, yet the very freedom that makes it so is our sacred trust. You and I are heavy investors in the fast-changing times. We can keep pace only if we are aware of and squarely meet our responsibilities. I feel a great pride in having a set of standards that have weathered a half century and have not been found wanting."

Thus again, in his own words, Senator Sordoni put forth his philosophy of life—a philosophy marked by ambition, integrity, loyalty, and a driving energy which composed the mold of this man's stature.

Cuba
Quarantine Legality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Eustace Seligman, Esq., is a distinguished international lawyer, a member of the New York law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, and a constituent of mine who I am very proud to represent in Congress. Mr. Seligman has written a most interesting article on "The Legality of U.S. Quarantine Action in Cuba," which appears in

the most recent Issue of the American Bar Association Journal. His analysis is a clear statement of why the U.S. action was consistent both with the United Nations Charter and with established principles of international law.

Mr. Seligman's article will be of great interest to my colleagues in the Congress, and I include it herewith:

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. QUARANTINE ACTION UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(By Eustace Seligman)

The question of whether the quarantine action taken by the United States was or was not a violation of its obligations under the U.N. Charter is one of great importance, and not merely to lawyers. We profess to believe in sanctity of obligations, we demand that of other nations, and yet we hear it frequently stated in connection with the Cuban quarantine that, since our national security was involved, we could not be deterred by legal niceties.

Was our action in imposing the quarantine of this nature in violation of our written word? It is believed not, for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE 2(4) OF THE CHARTER

The basic restriction on the use of force in the U.N. Charter is article 2(4). The article does not expressly prohibit all use of force—but only force of specific kinds. It reads as follows:

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

In order for a use of force to come within the prohibition of article 2(4) it must be of a kind enumerated unless the enumeration is to be deemed surplusage and ignored, which would appear to be unjustified by any sound rule of construction.

As is stated in Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 1958, at page 151:

"This, in effect, was the construction which the United Kingdom agent, Sir Eric Beckett, sought to place on the article in contending before the International Court of Justice in the Corfu Channel case that 'Operation Retail,' the subsequent minesweeping operation, was not contrary to Article 2(4). He said:

"But our action on the 12th/13th November threatened neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of Albania. Albania suffered thereby neither territorial loss nor any part of its political independence."

"As previously indicated, the finding of the Court, against the United Kingdom on this point, made no specific reference either to this argument or indeed to article 2(4)."

Writers on international law have expressed conflicting views on the question. However, Bowett, after weighing them, concludes at page 152:

"Despite these reasons it is submitted that, the phrase having been included, it must be given its plain meaning. Moreover, to give it its plain meaning coincides with the limitations on the obligation of nonintervention which traditional international law recognizes."

Unless article 2(4) is construed to prevent all use of force, it is difficult to conceive of any use of force which would be more clearly excluded from the scope of article 2(4) than a quarantine to prevent the introduction of offensive weapons. The quarantine was not a use of force—

- (a) Against the territorial integrity of Cuba, or
- (b) Against the political independence of Cuba, or
- (c) In any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations—

which the paramount one under article 1 is to maintain peace and security—the objective of the quarantine.

It would, therefore, appear that under the sound construction of article 2(4), which has heretofore been advocated by Britain, the U.S. quarantine did not violate its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

SELF-DEFENSE

Even if article 2(4) could be construed to include in its prohibition the use of force involved in a quarantine, it is well recognized that it cannot properly be construed to prohibit a quarantine or any other use of force, if carried out in self-defense.

This question is fully discussed in Bowett, in the work cited, who concludes at page 186:

"For these reasons we would maintain that the obligation assumed under article 2(4) is in no way inconsistent with the right of self-defense recognized in international law."

However, the use of the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the Charter raises a further question as to whether the Charter as a whole should be construed to forbid "anticipatory" self-defense—that is, action prior to an actual armed attack. Article 51 reads as follows:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

There is a full discussion of this question also in Bowett, who concludes at page 191:

"It is not believed, therefore, that article 51 restricts the traditional right of self-defense so as to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an armed attack occurs. In our view such a restriction is both unnecessary and inconsistent with article 2(4) which forbids not only force but the threat of force, and, furthermore, it is a restriction which bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."

The traditional right of self-defense which it is believed was preserved by the Charter has been described by Westlake, *International Law*, second edition 1910, part I, page 312, as follows:

"A state may defend itself, by preventive means if in its conscientious judgment necessary, against attack by another state, threat of attack, or preparations or other conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. In so doing it will be acting in a manner intrinsically defensive even though externally aggressive."

From this it follows that the legality of the quarantine depends upon whether it was an act of genuine self-defense even though anticipatory, or in fact an unprovoked act of aggression. The answer to this is clear: The conveying to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet powers of offensive weapons was the initiating cause which led to the U.S. reaction and was a threat to U.S. security. The unprovoked and unjustified secret installation of offensive nuclear weapons in an area previously free from them and close to another state, creates a threat to such other state justifying under the right of self-defense the use of force in order to cause their removal.

Applying the test laid down by Westlake quoted above, the installation of such weapons under all the attendant circumstances, including Castro's threats against Guantanamo and various Latin American countries, was conduct "from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended."

Who outside the Kremlin knows what the purpose was of secretly building up nuclear offensive weapons in Cuba, located so as to be able to bypass our DEW line radar detection network? Was another Pearl Harbor planned? Or was it intended once the installation was completed to deliver to us an ultimatum to withdraw from West Berlin, Europe, Turkey or elsewhere? Surely the possibility of this was sufficiently great so as to justify our taking immediate action to remove the danger.

Furthermore, the limited nature of the U.S. reaction confirms that it was defensive only and solely designed to eliminate the threat to its security caused by the introduction of the offensive weapons. Consequently, the quarantine was not an act of aggression prohibited by the obligations we have entered into when we signed the U.N. Charter.

One of the problems raised by the claim of self-defense is the difficulty of deciding when it is false and when legitimate. The justification of anticipatory self-defense has frequently been falsely advanced—as in the case of Hitler's claim in September 1939 that Germany had been attacked by Polish troops. This, however, is no reason for denying reliance upon it when it is in fact justified.

The United Nations Charter has endeavored to solve this problem by recognizing the necessity of an immediate unilateral decision by a threatened state of when and how to react, but under article 51 requires it to report immediately to the Security Council the action taken. This is clearly set forth in Oppenheim's *International Law*, eighth edition, 1957, edited by Lauterpacht, volume 1, at page 299:

"The reason of the thing, of course, makes it necessary for every state to judge for itself, in the first instance, whether a case of necessity in self-defense has arisen. But, unless the notion of self-preservation is to be eliminated as a legal conception, or unless it is used as a cloak for concealing deliberate breaches of the law, it is obvious that the question of the legality of action taken in self-preservation is suitable for determination and must ultimately be determined by a judicial authority or by a political body, like the Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity. The Charter lays down expressly that measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council."

This obligation to report to the Security Council was complied with by the United States.

Oppenheim (op. cit. p. 299) gives the following example of the exercise of the right of anticipatory self-defense, of a far more extreme nature than the quarantine:

"After the peace of Tilsit of 1807, the British Government was cognizant of a secret article of this treaty, according to which Denmark should, in certain circumstances, be coerced into declaring war against Great Britain, and France should be enabled to seize the Danish fleet so as to make use of it against Great Britain. As Denmark was not capable of defending herself against an attack of the French Army in North Germany under Bernadotte and Davoust, who had orders to invade Denmark, the British Government requested Denmark to deliver up her fleet to the custody of Great Britain, and promised to restore it after the war. Denmark, however, refused to comply with the British demands; whereupon the British considered that a case of necessity in self-defense had arisen, shelled Copenhagen, and seized the Danish fleet."

In a footnote Lauterpacht states that: "The action of Great Britain in this case, while condemned by most continental writers, is approved by many British and American writers."

One of the British writers who states that this action is justifiable in our opinion is Westlake.

Two other arguments should be considered in connection with our reliance on self-defense. First, it has been urged that the Russian-Cuban action was not a threat of the use of force, but itself justified by self-defense of Cuba to prevent a U.S. invasion. This contention is clearly fictitious. The Castro regime has been in power for almost 4 years and yet no attempt has been made by U.S. forces to invade the island. On several occasions Cuba has appealed to the Security Council to ask protection against a threatened invasion, but has never been able to adduce evidence in support of its claim. Finally, proof conclusive of its falsity was furnished when at the time of the landing at the Bay of Pigs by the returning Cubans we refused to give them the assistance of our Air Force which they desired.

Second, it has been suggested that if the position of the United States is sound, it follows that the action which the United States took in establishing a base in Turkey was similarly a threat to the peace in violation of the Charter.

This suggestion is without merit for the following reasons:

The action we took in Turkey was not the initiating action of an aggressive nature, but our response to the prior aggressive steps taken by Russia in its expansionist program, and was of a defensive nature. As has been well stated by Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a letter to the *New York Times* of October 29, 1962:

"There are few things less in keeping with our national tradition or desires than to have, in time of peace, armed forces of the United States stationed far from home at distant points around the globe. Yet we have felt obliged to break with tradition and preference in response to Soviet conduct, which has, ever since the fall of Czechoslovakia, in and out of the United Nations carried the conviction that the Soviet Union has in no sense placed limits on its well-advised determination to spread its dominion to the farthest corners of the earth."

"Our bases, accordingly, represented an important, if by no means the only, contribution we have made to the defense of the non-Soviet world against the overweening ambitions of the Kremlin."

"The Soviet missile base in Cuba, on the other hand, is of quite a different character. 'Our history,' as Mr. Kennedy said in his eloquent address, 'unlike the Soviet's since the end of World War II, demonstrates we have no desire to conquer or dominate any other nation or impose our system on its people.'"

"The masters of the Kremlin know as well as we do that the missile base, so furtively under construction in Cuba, cannot possibly be regarded as essential either to the defense of the Soviet Union or Cuba. Located close to our shores, it is purely aggressive in nature and furnishes evidence that the Soviet Union still regards the threat of a nuclear holocaust as a useful instrument for advancing Soviet objectives."

THE ACTION OF THE O.A.S.

It has been suggested by our State Department that there is a different legal basis for the quarantine in the resolution adopted on October 23, 1962, by the Council of the O.A.S. authorizing action which would include and go beyond the quarantine. The argument advanced is that the Charter specifically recognizes regional organizations and assigns to them an important place in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in that article 52(1) states that—

"Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or

March 4

A1144

agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

It is urged that this article gives to regional organizations the right to use force collectively for the removal of threats to the peace in their region in a situation where an individual state would not have the right to use force.

This position seems to be of doubtful validity. Certainly the wording of article 52(1) above quoted gives it no support. Nor do the debates at the San Francisco Conference and the discussion there of the Act of Chapultepec support the suggested construction, for that act specifically provided only for the collective use of force to prevent or repel aggression.

It would therefore seem that under the charter the resolution of the OAS would not justify the quarantine action by the United States if it had not been justified, absent the resolution.

The resolution does, however, have very real weight on the issue of the validity of the contention of the United States that the quarantine was in fact an act of self-defense. Instead of relying on a unilateral decision of the United States that it was acting in self-defense, there is now the unanimous judgment of the 20 members of the OAS after considering the evidence that the peace of the continent was threatened and that the United States and the other members should take necessary action including the use of armed force to stop the flow of offensive missiles into Cuba.

In addition the resolution of the OAS furnishes convincing refutation to the asserted claim referred to above, that the United States was contemplating an invasion of Cuba to overthrow Castro and that the installation of even offensive weapons was defensive and not a threat of aggression. Surely it could not be claimed that the 20 members of the OAS all contemplated joining in an invasion of Cuba; nor could they have believed that the United States had such a plan in mind when the resolution of October 23 was adopted by them. On the contrary, this resolution constitutes their unanimous judgment that this excuse for the introduction of missiles in Cuba is unjustified.

This action of the OAS is thus of the greatest importance in confirming that the quarantine was an act of self-defense and that the action of the United States was not in violation of its obligation under the charter.

FTC Chairman Rand Dixon Explains Interesting Historical Aspects of Our Antitrust Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, one of Tennessee's distinguished citizens, Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, made a most interesting address last Friday, dealing with antitrust laws that the Congress has enacted during the past 75 years. In his speech he points out—in a most persua-

sive manner—various reasons why our antitrust laws are so important to our economy and to our way of life. Moreover, explains Chairman Dixon, these laws are of tremendous benefit to businessmen themselves.

Believing firmly that the Members of Congress will find this address highly informative as well as interesting, I include it under unanimous consent in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

THE TRADE REGULATION LAWS—MAGNA CARTA OF FREE ENTERPRISE

When Wil Daniels, your legislative counsel, invited me to address you, I explained that because of the apparel industry litigation now pending before the Commission, it would be inappropriate for me to publicly discuss any of the issues raised there. But he insisted that you would like to have me anyway, and that I could talk about anything I wanted to. With an offer like that, how could I refuse? It isn't every day that I can earn my dinner so easily and pleasantly. In fact, appearing here today is so heavily loaded on the side of pleasure—beginning with the fact that it's warm here in Miami and unpleasantly cold in Washington—that I feel almost guilty about leaving my desk and calling it business.

This feeling is heightened, of course, by the fact that yours is a group that appears to have little need for my services as an adviser on antitrust and trade regulation matters. Indeed, the coat and suit industry has distinguished itself in so many ways that my first inclination is to say "Bravo. Keep up the good work," and then sit down. As a matter of fact, I can think of at least two reasons why it would be a good idea to do just that: It would be in accord with that ancient maxim "quit while you're ahead," and, because there are so few virtues in a speaker that are appreciated quite as much as brevity, it would probably win me an award as speaker of the year.

But seriously, I do want to tell you that it is a real pleasure to address this particular group. First, I am an ardent admirer of your remarkable record in the labor relations field. This Board, the industry's spokesman, is itself something of a wonder: an industrywide governing group that includes representatives of both management and labor. And, secondly, I am even more pleased with your devotion to the principles and the practice of vigorous but fair competition. With 1,600 members (comprising some 90 percent of the coat and suit industry), you are, of course, a classic example of the small business group. Competition, I am told, is flourishing nicely.

In an atmosphere as congenial as this one, it would be inappropriate, of course, for me to hold forth on the negative aspects of antitrust and trade regulation. So I have left at home my "fire and brimstone" sermon, the one I use when addressing groups that are known to have departed rather widely from the straight and narrow path of antitrust compliance. The sermon you are about to hear is my other one—the one I reserve for speeches to those groups that, at the very least, are with me in principle. This group, I believe, goes beyond that. I believe you actually practice what I preach.

But just as the preacher does not address himself solely to the sinners in his flock, lest the faithful become less so from sheer lack of continuing inspiration, I think it is quite appropriate to discuss with you a principle that the business community at large has never seemed to grasp fully. This is the fact that the antitrust and trade regulation laws are not shackles on the free enterprise system, but simply a tool for striking off the chains that some businessmen

insist upon forging for their fellows. It is no exaggeration to say—as the title of this speech declares—that this body of law is no less than the magna carta of free enterprise. I say this because an excellent case can be made for the proposition that, if the people of this country, through their elected representatives in Congress, has not seen fit to enact these laws, we could very well be living today under the restrictive cartel system that flourished in Europe in the years preceding World War II, or under some form of public ownership of industry that would be even less congenial to our democratic institutions.

It may seem at first blush that it is a contradiction in terms to say that the trade "regulation" laws are designed to increase the liberty of those to whom they are directed. But there is no such contradiction in fact. Red lights placed at busy intersections may seem irksome to those who like to live dangerously. But to those of us who value life and limb, those traffic signals represent simply the efforts of a well-disposed local government to keep us as free as possible from traffic dangers. It is, in short, the old principle of distinguishing between liberty and license—between freedom and anarchy.

Hence the antitrust and trade regulation laws were conceived not in hostility to the principles of laissez-faire capitalism, but in direct support of it. Just as it would be absurd to say that traffic lights were placed at intersections for the purpose of impeding the flow of automobiles, so it is equally unsound to say that laws prohibiting the destruction of competition are themselves designed to hinder the system they protect. On the contrary, the antitrust and trade regulation laws are conservative measures in every meaningful sense of that term—they were intended not to alter the existing economic order but to preserve it and protect it from forces hostile to its continued existence.

In order to appreciate the profound conservatism of these laws, one need only reflect for a moment on the economic and political history that gave rise to them. Capitalism itself, of course, is a comparatively recent development. Prior to the industrial revolution that produced it, wealth was produced and distributed by one of two basic methods: (1) by sovereign command, as in Soviet Russia today, and (2) by custom and tradition, as in medieval Europe where each man automatically followed the trade of his father. The latter system, which was the immediate predecessor in Europe of capitalism, was often regulated in the full sense of that word. In France, for example, a regulation promulgated by Colbert sought to curb the weaving industry's undue tendency toward initiative by requiring that fabrics woven in particular towns were to contain a precise number of threads, neither more nor less. At Avalon, fabrics were to contain 1,378 threads—no more and no less. And in England, at the behest of the button-makers guild, a law was passed imposing a fine on tailors who made cloth buttons and on consumers who wore them.¹

The industrial revolution with its burgeoning factories and mass-production machinery hurst all of these bonds with a wrench that shook society to its very foundations. In the place of the master craftsman and his one or two apprentices, there suddenly emerged the capitalist with his hundreds of employees and fortunes made almost overnight. Richard Arkwright, who invented (or stole) the spinning throstle, is said to have left, on his death in 1792, an estate valued at £500,000.² As a young man he had been apprenticed to a barber.

Footnotes at end of speech.

very directly reflective of public sentiment, thus demonstrates more than ever the apathy, indifference, and lack of understanding that besets America in this field. Without doubt, eclipsing all other nonpolitical issues either domestic or international, the paramount problem of this time is whether communism and capitalism can live in one world in peaceful coexistence or are destined to clash in the death throes of hydrogen warfare. Tactical maneuvering by the Communists has warmed the cold war as this report is written, to a point where it is seriously urged that the United States maintain a 24-airborne, hydrogen and atomic bomb equipped air alert against the possibility of surprise Communist attack. Khrushchev's treatment of the President of the United States at the recent attempted Summit conference has beyond question materially increased world tensions but is of value in revealing the real Communist attitude toward this Nation.

It is impossible to assess the problem of internal security without regard to these international factors. This is for the reason that communism is international in scope and purpose and seeks the destruction of all free nations everywhere in the world by force and violence if other means fail. This objective with regard to the United States has never been clearer than in the propaganda of hatred toward the United States that is daily taught the youth of the Soviet Union and its satellites and by devious means is spread among the youth of other lands to inflame them against the American imperialists and warmongers. That such propaganda efforts can be successful has been proven last month in Japan. That it continues unabated is reported daily at intelligence levels within the U.S. Department of State, particularly in reference to Latin America and Mexico.

How much of the same pernicious propaganda is being distributed to young and old in this country is hard to know. The number of Communist-front groups and organizations infiltrated by Communists is reported by Federal committees to be substantial, each having its particular segment of the Communist mission reflecting the Communist Party line of the moment. How far such propaganda separately or cumulatively may contribute to persuade otherwise loyal American citizens to renounce that loyalty and to become agents for the Communist Party and agents for communism generally is impossible to assess. It is indisputable, however, that as this report is written there has been a recent noticeable resurgence of Communist activity both open and secret throughout the entire United States. That this was predictable was stated by your chairman when president of this association in Sun Valley in June 1957. The suggestion from sources that should know better that Communist activity in this country is some kind of lawful political activity privileged from surveillance by reason of the first amendment has noticeably emboldened and broadened written and spoken activity on the part of Communists throughout the United States.

We should all be grateful that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Barenblatt v. United States*, 260 U.S. 109 (June 1959), with reference to the Communist Party has now said that those who would claim that it was "just an ordinary political party from the standpoint of national security, is to ask this Court to blind itself to world affairs which have determined the whole course of our national policy since the close of World War II—and to the vast burdens which these conditions have entailed for the entire Nation."

Your committee believes that there is even more pressing present need to keep abreast

of Communist activities throughout the Nation than existed 10 years ago. We are distressed by the apathy, the complacency, the indifference, and even the blindness of too many comfortably situated Americans who hear Khrushchev in Austria claim that the Communist Party line has eliminated force and violence but remain uneasily aware that throughout history every Communist leader since Karl Marx has said that war between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Your committee is strongly of the view that the internal security of each State would be materially improved by procedures designed to enable each State government to be kept advised of the nature and extent of the operations of Communists in that State. For such purposes the use of the subpoena power through legislative investigation is indispensable. In this view the committee is aware of the fact that Communist Party members have not carried cards for more than a decade. It also knows that many of the so-called intelligentsia who knowingly and intentionally work for and in behalf of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations have never assayed membership for reasons obvious. Your committee continues to be of the abiding conviction that every Communist in the United States is a potential security risk and that State and Federal policy should not fail to take due cognizance of this fact.

The relationship of the foregoing to the internal security of each State is clear. In this time no attorney general on behalf of any State can disregard within his State, Communist operations whatever they may be. As attorneys and members of the bar sworn to uphold the Constitution of State and Nation, it is our fundamental moral and legal responsibility to exert every lawful means to keep apprised of the machinations of those who would destroy our Constitution, our system, and our way of life.

Your committee recognizes that no amount of fixed doctrine, nor Maginot-line-type of education can vest us with that vitality necessary to meet and defeat the challenge of communism without war. We also recognize that this challenge must be met and defeated without war or there will be little left in the world but chaos and destruction. Therefore, with confidence in the capacity of an intelligent and informed free citizenry to fashion a better panacea for tomorrow's citizens than can be offered by communism, and with confidence that the day will soon come when the courts will affirm in indisputably decisive language the principle that those who claim the priceless benefits of American citizenship and the protection of its laws owe to their State and Nation both moral and legal responsibility to answer relevant questioning relating to the security of our people, your committee reports that the internal security of the Nation is under continuing Communist stress which is being partially met by active State and Federal countermeasures. It is felt that a much larger complementary role in this struggle might be effectively waged by State agencies, and to the extent that each member of this association in his State can assist in this direction, he is respectfully urged to do so.

Most Americans are concerned by the developments in Cuba as well as in other less easily recognized locations in this hemisphere indicating intentional aggressive Communist penetration of what has always been heretofore considered a place of primary concern and control of the United States. It is shocking to see American properties and American citizens and companies pushed around and discriminated against by the Castro government while we stand by and just watch. Economic sanctions in such circumstances are not enough if this coun-

try or its citizens are to have any self-respect left. Nothing is perhaps accomplished by descriptive adjectives, but your committee is beginning to wonder whether the world thinks we are afraid to stand up for what we believe in.

To put off dealing firmly with a situation of outright Soviet military aid to the Castro government in Cuba is to mortgage the future day when a much worse problem is presented with Panama. In terms of the internal security of the United States—not solely of the State of Florida—it is simply intolerable that we should permit the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast even if it takes force to prevent it. The same principle applies to the unlawful thefts and discriminations by the Castro government against Americans in Cuba. The impetus to this new aggression is undeniable. How can any American be safe in any Caribbean travel if this Nation will not protect him against outlawry?

For many years the unpleasant moment which is now upon us has been foreseeably predictable from American policies which have deferred the day of reckoning by continued appeasement of Communist aggression.

Just as surely as this Nation misled Britain and France into believing that they might with our sanction use force to defend their interests against Nasser's taking of the Suez Canal, and misled the Hungarian people into believing we would help if they would rise up and rid themselves of communism's yoke, it is a certainty that we would use force to prevent the taking over of the Panama Canal should the Panamanian Government become too friendly with the Soviet Union, accept its aid and military supplies as Egypt has done, and attempt to seize it.

We should meet the Cuban aggression now. Latin America and the entire Caribbean are watching.

The conclusion is inescapable that the United States must be ready to risk war to keep hostile Communist military establishments out of this hemisphere. The heavy logistical burden of maintaining effective military defensive action in Indochina and other places in the Far East is not present with respect to operations in this hemisphere. Those who claim that if we can arm bases in Turkey the Communists have the right to do so in Cuba, are intellectually dishonest, for the mission, objective, and spiritual dedication of the American people as well as American policy is neither imperialist nor aggressive toward any other nation in the world, whereas Soviet communism aims at unlawful world domination and individual slavery by aggression and violence all over the world.

Neither in terms of international law nor in the field of propaganda is there merit to any charge that by acting to prevent such military preparations by a foreign enemy power in this hemisphere, we are imperialists. As Americans the United States seeks nothing other than a world in which freedom and equal justice under law will stand some reasonable assurance of continuing in peace. Such a position, properly explained to the peoples of the world, is all the moral sanction we need. If the Communists can get away with what is going on in Cuba in plain view, we stand (and deserve) to lose not only the respect but in all probability the support, of a great majority of the countries of Latin America.

No thorough contemporary assessment of our internal security in this time should fail to appraise the intrinsic will of the American people to fight to preserve the American way of life. Such an appraisal does not lend to optimism for the future

safety of this Nation. The dedication and purpose with which many Communists approach the problems of the education and orientation of youth, application of their work, elimination of wasted time, and indoctrination in young and old of a single-mindedness of purpose toward a Communist world, is a caution for all of us in our opulence. While we should not endeavor to indoctrinate our youth with the same virus of hatred with which the youth of the Soviet Union and other countries are being infected toward this Nation as a germ warfarer and imperialist aggressor, nevertheless, it is of the first order of importance that the generation now being trained by us should be fully and completely aware of the nature, purposes and objectives of international Communism in relation to those of American constitutional government. Anything short of this is to send our younger generation into the world ill prepared to wage the struggle for the minds of mankind that reaches from the Congo to Oslo. It is not enough only to offer these explanations to our own youth. In the schools of the friendly nations of this world we must send our qualified representatives to tell the truth concerning the United States and its role as protector of freedom and individual liberty.

No State in this Union has internal security if the United States itself is insecure.

At this moment Communist enemy forces are actively at work aiding existing hostile nations and seeking to further encourage other younger nations now frenzied with nationalism by propagandizing them that America, like John Bull of old, is against their nationalism, and that the West seeks to prevent their independence.

Unilateral Western talks on disarmament are bound to be ineffective, as have been those spheres of United Nations activity that have required concurrence of the Soviet bloc. We can never disarm as long as the Soviet does not also do so. We can never safely disarm without contemporaneous full and complete inspection. The world is not going to obtain such a commitment from Communists. In the meantime, the race toward the neutron bomb, the satellite mirror, and the military conquest of space goes on at the expense of the soundness of our fiscal structure.

For the immediate present there is little doubt that defense requires continued sorely needed U.S. billions even at the price of more deficit and a correspondingly weaker dollar, but one has only to project such a situation continued over the next two decades to arrive at the conclusion that short of that time some way must be found to stop it or the economic structure of the United States will be ruined—itsself a Communist objective.

If millions upon millions of young men and women now growing up throughout the world continue to be indoctrinated with communism's philosophy of the use of unlawful force, of class struggle, of hatred, of the justification for subversion in the name of a Communist world, of the justness of atheism and alleged soundness of the material concept of the explanation and derivation of the universe, it means only one thing for us within our lifetime—aggressive war upon this country. This is because young adults trained in this manner from earliest adolescence in their willingness to destroy us will exceed even the banal of the Kamikaze pilot in World War II who was sure he was on his way to Japanese heaven. These, with the many now in their forties in Japan and in Germany who also hate this Nation in the memory of the destruction heaped upon theirs in World War II, make the projection almost a dismal certainty.

Some say that the only way the people of this country will awake to the need for authorization of powerful and effective governmental action to combat further Communist aggression is an attack upon us. The price of this would be the infinite horrors of atomic destruction, for we would certainly retaliate. Short of the shock of an attack, some method must be found to jar Americans from their complacency and inspire them to authorize their legislatures and the Congress to firmly take those steps in our behalf that must be taken to make certain that not one additional inch of the earth's surface nor one additional citizen of the world's population, adult or juvenile, is added to the Soviet Communist bloc.

Along with such a governmental policy, if Americans traveling abroad conclusively demonstrate by word and deed that we are for peace, freedom, and justice for all, and that communism means individual slavery, we are bound to succeed, for ours is the more attractive package.

Only a blind man would disregard the situation now existing. Internal security in our States is inadequate. We should not delude ourselves to the contrary. Internal security is literally dependent on the external security of the United States itself.

We have implicit confidence that just as communism is atheistic and denies the existence of God, so are we and our allies essentially law-abiding, God-fearing men and women. If Divine Providence and the omnipotence of Almighty God are to be made manifest upon this earth in our time it must mean that in this struggle we will win. Faith alone, however, is not enough. Strength in meeting any public challenge to American authority is indispensable.

As attorneys general let us as one firmly reject any governmental policy, State or Federal, that includes further appeasement or equivocation in dealing with Communist aggression. In firmness reflecting our genuine concern for the peace and security of the world will be found the only sure road to an honorable peace which will result from aggressors' unwillingness to face the showdown if we stand firm. The hour is late but not too late.

If we continue to show an incredulous world that we are unwilling to fight to preserve our freedom or that of our allies, the balance of world power will swing to the Soviet Union. Should this happen, we predict that whether resulting from ultimatum or secretly in the night, The United States will suffer a major and terrible attack—an avoidable catastrophe if we have the courage now to stand firmly for freedom.

Your committee respectfully recommends that the committee on internal security be continued, instructed, and authorized to keep the association advised of the progress of the association's recommendations for legislation in the field of internal security and of such other matters relating to internal security as may in the opinion of the committee, be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. The chairman has been authorized to prepare and deliver to the resolutions committee a resolution to this effect.

Respectfully submitted,

LOUIS C. WYMAN,

Chairman.

Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the concepts expressed in this report will soon become an integral part of American policy.

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

(Mr. RUMSFELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday on the floor of the House, I revealed that during 1962 there had been a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China as reported in the annual report of the Panama Canal Company. At that time, I indicated that I had written the President of the United States urging prompt consideration of the advisability of denying the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels trading with Cuba. At that time, I further urged a study of this question by the House of Representatives. Today I rise to report that I am introducing a House resolution which it is hoped will provide the impetus to bring about such a study by the appropriate committee of the House.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels engaged in trade with Cuba.

Since the rise of Castro, there has been, to my knowledge, little or no consideration of the possibility of denying the use of the Panama Canal to ships trading with Cuba. In view of the above report that during 1962 there was a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the canal to Red China and a 48-percent increase to Russia, and in view of the fact that CIA Chief John A. McCone, in his February 19 statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee emphasized the increasingly serious problem of subversion spreading from Cuba to South America and stated that at least 1,000 to 1,500 South Americans went to Cuba in 1962 for sabotage and guerrilla training, with more going this year, I consider such a study necessary—without delay.

Our goal must be to weaken the Castro regime, to prevent the spread of communism from Cuba to the continent of South America, and, hopefully, to bring about the eventual downfall of the Castro dictatorship. I do not suggest that I am an expert on Cuban or South American affairs. However, from a study of a map of this hemisphere, it seems logical to predict that once the Communists have established a firm position on the continent of South America, we will have lost in large part the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents as a method of preventing the strengthening of communism in this hemisphere. Today the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism: tomorrow it may not.

The situation today represents a major danger to all of the American nations. Its solution will require the United States to assume and maintain a capacity of leadership, with the cooperation of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to the extent possible. This is not, in my opinion, saber rattling. A leadership vacuum exists, and we must fill it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are obstacles to restricting the use of the

Panama Canal. We have treaties with Panama—the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Convention of 1903—and with Great Britain—the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901—to mention two. However, if, after study, it is considered desirable to deny the use of the canal to vessels trading with Cuba, there are ways to do it. If it is impossible under existing agreements, these agreements can be revised, as they have been before. We can ask the cooperation of the Organization of American States. We can consider extending our right to deny the use of U.S. ports to include those ports at either end of the canal. We can consider the possibility of, liberally interpreting these treaties of the early 1900's to permit such action in view of the cold war of 1963.

Regrettably, we have lost much of the advantage we held some months ago. To wait further could result, within a matter of months, in having communism firmly established on the continent of South America. We cannot afford four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere. I urge prompt consideration of this resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a column from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 1, discussing Communist trade through the canal, and an editorial from the Chicago's American of February 25, concerning the recent OAS report urging the individual member nations to invoke the 1948 Rio Treaty for their mutual defense against Communist Cuba. I also refer the Members of the House to the recent testimony of CIA Chief John McCone, before the Foreign Affairs Committee for a discussion of the seriousness of the problem of Communist subversion in South America:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Chicago's American, Feb. 25, 1963]

WARNING TO THE OAS

A report just made public by the Organization of American States soberly warns that individual member nations can no longer defend themselves adequately against the threat of Communist Cuba, and urges them to invoke the 1948 Rio treaty for mutual defense.

The report was submitted by a special 7-man study group and is "advisory," meaning that it doesn't have official OAS approval. Getting it adopted will involve many a wrangle, since some of its recommendations—for instance, breaking off all hemisphere relations with the Castro government—are still regarded as controversial by some member states. But the United States and other governments aware of the danger should press hard for approval; there isn't much time to spare.

What has been revealed of the report is restrained and factual, and does not indulge in nightmares. It points out that Castro and the Soviets have developed in Cuba a "political-military apparatus" which is expressly designed to get around the haphazard security measures now in force. Against the Communists' highly engineered techniques of subversion and agitation, the hemisphere's defenses aren't much beyond what they were in 1948, and are simply not adequate for the job.

One sorely needed element, the report said, is coordination of intelligence and counterespionage work among the hemi-

sphere's free nations. Without that, they won't have the means to plan and carry out joint action. The report also called for organizing, equipping, and training security forces of the American republics to counter subversion and guerilla activity directed from Cuba.

This does not mean that the United States should rely wholly on cooperative action against Cuba. As Defense Secretary McNamara said last week in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, it is United States policy to eliminate Castrosim and communism from Cuba, and that's a job that will have to be handled principally by this country.

But the United States cannot police the rest of the hemisphere against subversion and guerrilla attacks. That will be up to the governments involved—and they'd better get together fast on ways to do it.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 1, 1963]

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Red China and Soviet Russia are making very good use of the Panama Canal in efforts to bulwark Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

The 1962 report of the board of directors of the Panama Canal Co. contains, on page 6, the following statement:

"Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year (1962) was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba."

Undoubtedly, Nikita Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung and Castro fully appreciate the use of this American-built and American-operated facility which helps them to carry out their Caribbean designs without the necessity for the long and expensive sea voyage around South America. The fact that the Panama Canal Co., which operates the canal for its owners, the taxpayers of the United States, spent \$16,100,000 to improve the canal in 1962 probably causes them to rejoice also.

Ships which transit the canal are required to pay for its use. Such payments are, no doubt, a bit of a load on the Cuban economy. But now that the traffic has been called to Washington's attention efforts will no doubt be made to remit the tolls on these shipments. Such action would be in line with the solicitous manner in which U.S. policy in respect to Castro's Cuba is currently conducted.

Why the United States should permit use of its facilities to undermine its position in the Caribbean is difficult to comprehend.

The statement that we are obligated by treaty and international law to permit transit of the canal by the ships of all nations is not a sufficient answer.

The United States doesn't recognize Red China. Treaties and international laws and practices which may be binding upon the United States insofar as other nations are concerned are not applicable to Red China. The United States has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. There may be a technical distinction between nonrecognition and the current status of United States-Cuban relations. That point is moot. If, however, the United States has the right to deny use of American ports to foreign ships engaged in the Cuban traffic, a right it has asserted, it can find ample legal grounds on which to deny use of the Panama Canal and its facilities, including the harbors, to the ships engaged in this particular traffic.

The ships engaged in the Sino-Soviet-Cuban traffic fly many flags. Those three Communist countries have relatively small

merchant marines. Much of the traffic is carried in Greek, British, Norwegian, Lebanese, Japanese, Polish and Yugoslav bottoms. These also should be forbidden use of the canal's facilities for this particular traffic.

If the American Government doesn't intend to employ every economic tool it has to bring about Castro's downfall it shouldn't announce such policies; halfway measures, such as it now engages in, are worse than none at all.

Since the ending of World War II Panama Canal traffic has increased 212 percent. In 1962 canal shipments between Red China and Cuba increased 600 percent over 1961. This huge increase gives some measure of the use to which this American-built, American-operated facility is being employed to thwart American policy in respect to Castro's Cuba.

The United States stopped buying Cuban sugar for the sole purpose of wrecking that island's economy and, in so doing, bringing about Castro's downfall. To prevent that downfall, Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals. As noted in the 1962 report of the Panama Canal Co., sugar shipments from Cuba to Red China and Soviet Russia "accounted for the vast majority of this (increase) combined tonnage."

This is but another example of the fact that the United States, as a consequence of inept policies and implementation, does more to defeat itself than all the Communist nations combined.

RESOLUTION TO PREVENT U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS FROM BEING USED FOR ASSISTANCE TO CUBA

(Mr. MONTOKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTOKA. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a resolution to the Congress to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba. The resolution provides that if the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance or the United Nations Special Fund hereafter provides any assistance, directly or indirectly, to Cuba, then the maximum U.S. contribution which may be made to that program or Fund, as the case may be, for the next calendar year shall be reduced by the amount spent by such program or Fund in providing such assistance to Cuba.

The recent decision by the U.N. Directorate to extend \$1,157,600 from the United Nations Special Fund for a 5-year project intended to diversify Cuban agriculture reveals the need for such a joint congressional resolution. U.S. officials strongly opposed the project, which was first considered in May, 1961, when it came up again before the Special Fund several weeks ago. It was argued that the likelihood of success for such a project was considerably less than when the project was first approved because of the increasing chaos, in fact the utter disorganization, of Cuban agriculture caused by Castro's follies. It was pointed out that some of Cuba's best agricultural experts had fled the country, that food production was in trouble, in short, that Castro's dictatorial hand and his inept policies were reflected throughout the agricultural sector. Foreign agents—Soviet agricultural experts—were replacing native technicians. And yet, the

Special Fund was not convinced by these arguments. The old contention that the extension of assistance must be decided on the basis of project feasibility alone—and that political considerations must play no part—was once again dragged out in support of the United Nations action. But do not these facts—the disorganization of Cuban agriculture, the inept agricultural policies of the Castro government, the presence of large numbers of Soviet agents—challenge the feasibility of the United Nations scheme?

Furthermore, Castro has not been noted for his cooperation with the United Nations in the past. He blocked the recent United States-Soviet negotiations on the crisis caused by the Soviet military buildup in Cuba at every point. He refused to allow United Nations inspectors on Cuban soil to verify the removal of Soviet offensive weapons. When Secretary General U Thant attempted to mediate in the crisis, Castro adamantly denied him every point. He alleged that Soviet bombers belonged to Cuba and could not be withdrawn without his consent. In short, Castro has failed to cooperate with the United Nations in political settlements in the past. Why should he now be granted Special Fund assistance? What guarantee is there that once United Nations experts arrive, Castro will aid their efforts? What about the Soviet agricultural experts? Will they and the U.N. technicians work hand in hand? The answers to these questions are vital to the feasibility of the project. The question marks are surely numerous enough to have made the Directorate think twice and then a third time before extending assistance to Castro.

Granted, these questions also involve political considerations, but political considerations of a sort which must be taken into account, I contend, in deciding upon any United Nations activity. The Special Fund criteria for determining what projects may be approved deny inclusion of political considerations. But what is meant by political considerations—the attempt of any one government or group of governments to influence a decision on the basis of its own, or their own, self-interest rather than in terms of the usefulness of the project to the country concerned and its chances for success? In the case of U.N. assistance to Cuba there are political considerations of a different sort—political considerations which touch upon not the relations of individual states with Cuba, but the relationship of international organizations, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations itself.

In the eyes of all Latin America Castro is an outlaw in the Western Hemisphere who is trying to subvert democratic governments throughout the hemisphere. The OAS declared him persona non grata in the inter-American system when the foreign ministers voted to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. Currently the OAS has undertaken a thorough study of the means by which Castro is attempting to infiltrate Latin America

and spread the gospel of communism. All Castro's actions—repression within Cuba, subversion without—contravene the cooperative and collective security bases of the Organization of American States. Castro is a threat to the hemisphere, a barrier to the cooperative efforts of the inter-American community, and an outlaw in the inter-American security system. Does he deserve international assistance? Can such assistance be justified in view of Castro's unlawful actions in the Western Hemisphere?

The same political considerations arise with regard to the United Nations itself. Castro's oppressive policies within Cuba—the execution of political prisoners, the forcing of thousands of citizens into exile, the denial of individual freedoms—make a mockery of United Nations efforts in the field of human rights. How can the world organization on the one hand spend years formulating basic codes of human rights in order to improve the condition of man throughout the world and on the other hand lend its assistance to a government which is flagrantly flouting basic individual freedoms? Furthermore, the chief purpose of the United Nations is preservation of peace and security; it was established as a collective security organization explicitly dedicated to deterring aggression. Yet, on this score, too, Castro is guilty. He allowed Cuba to become an open Soviet military base; he turned his island into a bridgehead of covert Soviet penetration in the Western Hemisphere. How can the United Nations extend assistance to a government which is subverting the basic purposes of the world organization, which is dedicated not to maintaining international peace and security but to deterring international peace and security?

Even more basic than these questions insofar as the U.S. Congress is concerned is the relationship between the United States and the United Nations, for it is in this area that the Congress can make itself heard. If the United Nations will not listen to the dictates of reason and justice, if it will not exert some sense of discrimination between a foolish and a wise course of action, if it will not accept its responsibility as an organization dedicated to the collective security of the world and the betterment of man's lot, the U.S. Congress can do nothing. It can only point out insufficiencies; it can only hope that wiser counsels will prevail in the future.

But as one of the branches of government engaged in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy, Congress has the right, and the duty, to make its will felt in the area of relations between the United States and the United Nations. It is in this spirit that the resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba was placed before the Congress. It is from a sense of responsibility for the foreign policy of the United States that the Congress is suggesting the President reduce future U.S. contributions to the U.N. or its agencies, in the event such contributions will be used for assistance to Cuba.

Paul Hoffmann, the Managing Director of the Special Fund and an American himself, it is true, has promised that no U.S. funds will be used on the Cuban project and that no U.S. technicians will be sent to Cuba. But this does not get at the root of the problem. For one thing, the substantial U.S. contribution to the Special Fund—\$28 million for 1963—will release other funds that can then be diverted to the Cuban project. Furthermore, Mr. Hoffmann's promise does not resolve future difficulties, future instances in which the United Nations may allocate assistance to Cuba. The problem is rather that the action of the U.N. Directorate in authorizing the agricultural assistance project for Cuba was in direct contravention of U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba. The United States, along with the rest of the Western Hemisphere, has declared itself the enemy of the Castro government. We are dedicated to weakening Castro's economic and political position in order to open the way for the establishment of a democratic government in Cuba. We have been attempting to put the economic squeeze on Castro—through the withdrawal of sugar quotas, the elimination of trade. We have urged our friends to do the same. The United Nations action, designed to improve Castro's agricultural sector, if successful, would strengthen rather than weaken Castro's position and is therefore in direct opposition to the avowed policy of the United States toward Cuba. If the United States succumbs quietly to the United Nations position, we are letting the United Nations make our foreign policy for us—and a foreign policy which, in this case, is far different from that which we have time and again stated we are pursuing with regard to Cuba. The U.S. Congress cannot allow the United Nations to take over the function of formulating U.S. foreign policy.

We feel too that it was impolitic of the United Nations to overlook the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the total contributions to the Special Fund for the year 1963, some \$28 million. While it may be true that the basis of the United Nations is the equality of member states as reflected in the one-state one-vote General Assembly, only too often the equality factor is overemphasized and it is forgotten that the great powers were given a preferred position in the world organization. The permanent member veto in the Security Council acknowledged that the powers had a special responsibility and that therefore they ought to have a special privilege in the United Nations. Should not some form of recognition be given to the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources, over 32 percent of the U.N. regular budget, and a major portion of the Congo operations? The United States has poured considerable financial resources into the United Nations. It has bailed the United Nations out of financial trouble. Just last summer the U.S. Congress authorized the President to purchase up to one-half of the total issue of U.N. bonds to finance peacekeeping

toughness and effectiveness of Ambassador William Attwood.

Ambassador Attwood, fluent in French and long accustomed to living in other lands, has toured every inch of Guinea and has won the country's admiration and respect. The Ambassador's lovely wife, Sim, is equally an effective force for the United States in Guinea. She has sacrificed much and undergone hardship. Life in Guinea is not easy, but she stays at her husband's side to share his burdens, and to ease the burdens of a new and proud nation whose main contact with the United States is the Attwoods. Bill Attwood contracted a bad case of polio while on duty in Guinea. He and Sim together fought it down, and went back to work.

Recently Ralph McGill wrote a piece in the Washington Star about the Attwoods. He was impressed with their dedicated work, and well he might have been. "Thanks to the Attwoods," writes Ralph McGill, "the hundreds of almost inaccessible villages of Guinea have been visited and have seen the American flag flying from the Ambassador's jeep."

A few years ago, before his present assignment, Bill Attwood, after years of traveling and living abroad as a foreign correspondent, wrote a book about the United States of America entitled "Still the Most Exciting Country." The title speaks for itself. It is their love for America that propels Bill and Sim Attwood to do what they do for Guinea. With the permission of the House, I am including Ralph McGill's article in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST AID AT THE U.S. EMBASSY

(By Ralph McGill)

CONAKRY, GUINEA.—It was just after breakfast that a tall, solemn African with a big-eyed, attractive little girl came to the terrace of the home of U.S. Ambassador William Attwood. He spoke politely in French. The tiny, slender girl, of about 5 years, took us all in with her somewhat fearful eyes.

She had, it developed, two badly infected ears. They had been pierced for rings, and a dirty string had been looped through each. Infection followed. Her ears were swollen about the lobes and pus pockets had formed behind each. The father knew that the Ambassador's wife did volunteer work at the hospital. He had brought his young daughter.

Mrs. Attwood went to her quickly, spoke to her, and sat her on a bench on the terrace. She then went into the house and returned with cotton, a bottle of antiseptic wash, and some antibiotic salve. The child sat quietly, her eyes large with apprehension of pain, while the Ambassador's wife carefully cleaned the infected areas, drained the pus from the boil-like swellings, and after another gentle but thorough antiseptic cleansing, applied the antibiotic salve. The father was then informed that when the ears of any other children were pierced, only strings which had been soaked in alcohol should be used to keep them opened, and that the piercing instrument also should be dipped in it. He thanked her, took the little girl's hand and walked away. The next morning she was back. The ears were much better. They got careful dressing.

Two days each week Mrs. Attwood and Mrs. Eugene Abrams, wife of the Embassy development officer, work as volunteer aids in the Conakry hospital. They help deliver babies, scrub beds, patients, and do all work usually done by hospital aids. The Ambassador

and the staff are popular and respected because they have earned it. It is relatively a small group, and to me it seems overworked. But it is dedicated and makes intelligent, understanding contact with the life of Guineans.

The Ambassador has traveled over most of the country, visiting where no automobiles have been. The roads traveled are often mere tracks between which grasses and weeds grow as high as the car itself. It is necessary to carry food and sleeping bags along. But the hundreds of villages have been visited and have seen the American flag flying from the Ambassador's jeep. They are a friendly people, eager to learn, and appreciative of respect and understanding.

Communication and education are imperative problems. But here everything is a necessity. This is more ironic because Guinea potentially is one of the richest countries in Africa. It has one-third of the world's known reserves of high grade bauxite. Many of its mountains are heavy with iron ore. Along the beaches are huge deposits of volcanic-looking stone. Much of it seems to be almost pure iron.

But Guinea was perhaps, the most neglected of the French colonies. Certainly this was true of education, roads and communications. The Soviet bloc has been busy, hoping to make a satellite of Guinea because of her desperate need for almost everything. But while Soviet aid still is being accepted, its barter aspects are hurting the economy and doing damage to the balance of trade. Other nations also are giving aid. That of the United States is relatively small, but has a high degree of sincerity and grassroots help. Here almost everything that is done seems a drop in the bucket. But drops can fill buckets. Nowhere is United States aid getting so much for its dollars as in Africa—and especially in Guinea.

Intelligent Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important editorial which appeared in the western edition of the New York Times on February 25, 1963. The editorial points out the pressing need for a joint congressional watchdog committee on intelligence. Since the Cuban crisis last October the desirability of such a committee has become increasingly apparent. I have reintroduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 145, which would establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. The New York Times editorial provides excellent arguments for the passage of this measure this session.

The editorial follows:

INTELLIGENT INTELLIGENCE

The adequacy of the Nation's intelligence services is again being scrutinized by Congress, as a byproduct of the continuing Cuban crisis. The inquiry of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, coincides by chance with the publication of an article by Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in which Mr. Dulles

takes his familiar stand against any further congressional controls over the Agency.

We think—as we have often said before—that Mr. Dulles is mistaken in this stand. The establishment of a carefully selected joint congressional watchdog committee on intelligence whose functions would approximate those of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, would provide important control over activities that are rooted in secrecy and conducted without benefit of the normal restraints and restrictions of democratic government.

Intelligence is a cornerstone upon which effective policy must be built. But intelligence agencies should not, themselves make policy, as they have sometimes done in the past. And the power they wield, which derives primarily from secrecy, is so great that it must be effectively monitored.

Such a joint committee should not be limited to supervision of the CIA alone. It should supervise the entire intelligence community for adequacy, effectiveness, and abuse. This control is all the more important now, since there are glaring gaps—for which no responsibility has been publicly assessed—in the intelligence picture presented to the Nation for last September and early October, when the Russian missile emplacement program in Cuba was at its height.

It is particularly important to weigh the effects on American intelligence capabilities of the recent enforced merger in the Pentagon of the three service agencies into a monolithic Defense Intelligence Agency. Senator STENNIS' committee will presumably find out whether this merger impaired intelligence collection or, even worse, facilitated the distortion of intelligence by top policymakers so that their evaluation of intelligence would accord with their preconceived policy. A joint congressional committee on intelligence, composed of carefully selected members of both parties and both Houses, would provide a continuing examination and control of all intelligence facilities, something that recent history shows is badly needed.

White House To Lose Humor and Buoyancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, of whom I am especially proud, is Miss Letitia Baldrige, Secretary to Mrs. John F. Kennedy. It is no secret that "Tish" Baldrige has done one of the most remarkable jobs in Washington, filling a demanding post with diplomacy, skill, and effectiveness. She has brought both beauty and brains to her job and has been a credit to the White House, to New York City, and to the congressional district from which she comes.

Recently, Miss Baldrige's resignation as secretary to the First Lady was announced simultaneously with her appointment as an executive of the Chicago Merchandise Mart. She will bring the same distinction to this position as she has to all others.

I am pleased also that Miss Baldrige will be succeeded in her White House

position by another constituent of mine—Miss Nancy Tuckerman. Miss Tuckerman is a splendid choice. Her appointment promises that the high standards set by Miss Baldrige will be maintained. Miss Tuckerman also brings brains and beauty to the job and will be a diplomatic and highly competent assistant.

Two fine articles about the Misses Baldrige and Tuckerman, written by Betty Beale and Daisy Cleland, recently appeared in the Evening Star. With the Speaker's permission I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that my colleagues join me in wishing both of these ladies success and happiness in their new endeavors:

(From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1963)

WHITE HOUSE TO LOSE HUMOR AND BUOYANCY (By Betty Beale)

No resignation of any White House personnel within the memory of this writer has caused the general gloom that "Tish" Baldrige's has. Few people in the political picture have ever been as popular as Mrs. Kennedy's social secretary.

Comments of sincere regret over her forthcoming departure were made by everybody from high ranking administration officials and other White House personnel to diplomats, men and women in the press corps, and dozens of people in Washington society.

Said the wife of an ambassador when she heard the news, "Can this be true? I am distressed to hear it."

Said a newswoman, "When her appointment was first announced I looked forward to her gaiety and charm and to those beautiful table settings she did so well for Tiffany, and she lived up to her advance billing. A great deal of humor and buoyancy is going out of the White House."

Said another, "No matter how mad I might get at the White House, it melted away when I saw 'Tish.'"

Said a very high official, "She's one of the best things that ever happened to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue."

As for her reasons for leaving the most glamorous residence in America, "Tish" said, "I have been a social secretary for 9 years and this is a step forward, and also a chance to get back into the international field which has always been my love. I was going off to Italy in January, 1961, to open my own public relations firm when Mrs. Kennedy offered me this job." Intimate friends believe that she made the decision at least 2 months ago.

She will have an executive job with Chicago's Merchandise Mart, which is owned by Joseph P. Kennedy, and "will travel abroad all the time," she said. It will give her a chance to use her languages. About the only chance she has now, chuckled Tish, is when she's talking to the chef.

She will move to Chicago. "But I will always come back here," she said, "I really love Washington and everybody in it."

It's mutual.

(From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
Feb. 21, 1963)

"TISH" BALDRIGE IS LEAVING JOB (By Daisy Cleland)

Letitia Baldrige, social secretary to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, is leaving her White House job as of the end of May.

Miss Baldrige, who will take an executive position in the Chicago Merchandise Mart complex, owned by Joseph P. Kennedy, the President's father, came in with the New Frontier.

While she has been considered an excellent social secretary to the White House and one who has masterminded social events more glamorous and imaginative than ever produced by a President and First Lady, it has been questioned for the past several months whether there has been friction between "Tish" Baldrige and some of the "palace guard."

Miss Baldrige came to the White House as a "natural" for the Kennedy ideas and expectations.

SAME SCHOOLS

She went to Miss Porter's School in Farmington, Conn., with Mrs. Kennedy (although 2 years ahead); she was on hand at Vassar when the First Lady began her college career, and later when the former Jacqueline Bouvier was studying in France. Miss Baldrige had started her career as social secretary to Mrs. David Bruce, whose husband was then U.S. Ambassador to France.

In addition, Miss Baldrige was personal and social secretary to Clare Boothe Luce when she was our Ambassador to Rome. She knows languages, menus, has humor and got a written tribute from the brilliant Mrs. Luce who said "I will never think of the villa (our Embassy in Rome) without thinking, with love and admiration of you, and of the dear contribution you made to my happiness, comfort and success in Rome."

SUCCESSOR PICKED

The replacement for Miss Baldrige is Miss Nancy Tuckerman, of New York.

Miss Tuckerman's background again blends with Mrs. Kennedy.

Both attended the Chapin School in New York and were roommates at Miss Porter's school. Both "came out" in 1947, were friends at East Hampton, Long Island, and each likes travel abroad.

Miss Tuckerman is reported to be "the short member of the family, with ash blond hair, huge blue eyes, tremendous chic, and a shy manner." She said in New York last night she was "surprised, interested, and excited" about the new job, and then added "I really don't particularly know how to run dinners or answer letters."

Mrs. Kennedy's former schoolmate was obviously picked for the job by the First Lady and with an extra pat on the back from Tish Baldrige.

Miss Tuckerman was invited to a White House state dinner one night and then a "job conference" the next morning.

She attended the dinner given by President and Mrs. Kennedy on January 21 in honor of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Chief Justice of the United States and their wives. The following morning she was picked up, by prearrangement, at the residence of her aunt and uncle, for an interview with Mrs. Kennedy which was followed by an offer of the job. On the White House dinner list for the evening before she was merely listed as "Miss Nancy Tuckerman, New York, school friend." Her name was 80th on the list.

Mrs. Jerauld Wright, wife of Admiral Wright, described her duties as an aunt when Nancy went off to the state dinner.

"She went off to the White House with her Uncle Jerry driving and with a borrowed piece of jewelry and small milk from me. We woke her early for her trip back to the White House the next morning and then she came back with something to mull over."

Miss Tuckerman is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Roger Tuckerman, of Farmington, and the granddaughter of Mrs. Phillips Thompson of Farmington. Her older sister is Mrs. John Gay, of Tuxedo Park, N.Y., and her brother, Roger Wolcott Tuckerman, who lives in New York, is married to Caryn Ryan, who once lived here. The latter's parents are the late Clendenin Ryan and Mrs. Ryan,

who lives in New York. She is also distantly related to the Walter Tuckerman family, well-known in Washington social circles.

"Tish" Baldrige, the author of a best seller written about her days with Mrs. Luce in Rome, was first named as Mrs. Kennedy's press secretary and she held a gay free-for-all press conference that few newswomen will forget.

Not only did she state she was sure Mrs. Kennedy's love of art might permit hanging paintings over paintings to be sure the modern school was represented, but she added in discussing the entertaining of club women the phrase of "vast hordes of women" and then changed the wordage with a grin to "I mean, large groups of interesting ladies."

SIDETRACKED FROM PRESS

Apparently the ease and humor of "Tish" was a fear for the Kennedys and their dealings with the press. The young woman, who knows so much about protocol, was cut off from the press.

In her role she has produced "stages" that the White House will find hard to come by—a dinner at Mount Vernon, complete with five courses and a symphony orchestra; a dinner with Nobel Prize winners where the President could state that there had never been so much talent and brilliance under the White House roof at one time since a night there when "Thomas Jefferson dined alone."

Miss Tuckerman states that it will be "exciting and interesting to work with her (Mrs. Kennedy), but I wish I had written 'Roman Candle'."

A Police State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, at the rate we are going, someday in the near future, I could be seized and flown away without bond, bail, or contact with relatives, for placing this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We must take special care in our great crusade for freedom and justice for all people that we do not trample justice into the dust. Likewise, while fighting Communist totalitarianism in the world, let us make sure we do not adopt Gestapo and totalitarian tactics here at home.

I commend to the attention of the Congress the excellent and timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 24, 1963:

GENERAL WALKER CLEARED

The Department of Justice appears to have reached the end of the road in its attempt to prosecute former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker in connection with last year's riot at the University of Mississippi.

This has been a strange business. After his appearance on the campus during the riot, in the course of which he made a disputed speech, General Walker was charged with insurrection, seditious conspiracy, conspiracy to impede and injure officers of the United States, and with assaulting, resisting and impeding officers. It sounded pretty serious—and for a time it was.

After being assured he would be released upon posting \$100,000 bond, an excessive sum, General Walker was flown from Mis-